HISTORY

OF THE

CATHOLIC CHURCH

IN THE

NINETEENTH CENTURY

(1789-1908)

Melbourne:
William P. Linehan,
309 Lit. Collins St.

PRINTED AND BOUND

IN IRELAND

HISTORY

OF THE

CATHOLIC CHURCH

IN THE

NINETEENTH CENTURY

(1789–1908)

BY

REV. JAMES MACCAFFREY

Lic. Theol. (Maynooth), Ph.D. (Freiburg i. B.)
Professor of Ecclesiastical History, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth

VOLUME II

SECOND EDITION, REVISED

Property of
CLgA
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library

DUBLIN AND WATERFORD
M. H. GILL AND SON, LTD.

ST. LOUIS, MO.
B. HERDER, 17 SOUTH BROADWAY
1910

24416

ALMA COLLEGE
270.8
LIBRARY
M123
Alma California

Nihil Obstat:

THOMAS O'DONNELL, C.M.
Censor Theol. Deput.

Imprimi Potest:

✠ GULIELMUS,
Archiep. Dublinen.,
Hiberniæ Primas.

Dublini, 8 *Novembris*, 1909

CONTENTS OF VOL. II

CHAPTER I

THE CHURCH IN GREAT BRITAIN

(*a*) *The Repeal of the Penal Laws in England* (1778–1829) PAGE

Position of Catholics in England in 1778—Relief Act of 1778—The Gordon riots—Appointment of a lay Catholic Committee—Policy of Catholic Committee—Its negotiations with Pitt and Stanhope—The Protestation and Oath of loyalty—Condemnation issued by the vicars—Relief Bill before the two Houses of Parliament—Summary of Act of 1791—Further dissensions among the Catholics—French *émigré* clergy in England—Establishment of English Catholic Colleges—Dr. Milner and the Catholic Board—The Fifth Resolution—Meeting of the vicars at Durham—Grattan's Relief Bill (1813)—Canning's amendments—Milner's expulsion from the Catholic Board—Quarantotti rescript—Milner in Rome—Letter of Pius VII. (1815)—Death of Milner 1–23

(*b*) *The Oxford Movement*

The Anglican Church in the early part of nineteenth century—Methodists and Evangelicals—Liberals, Whately and Thomas Arnold at Oxford—High Church party at Oxford—Keble, Froude, Newman—Sketch of Newman's career and his religious opinions—The Peel election in Oxford—Reform movement and Anglican Church—Newman and Froude in Rome—Keble's sermon on National Apostasy—*The Tracts for the Times*—Newman's share in them—Pusey—Appointment of Dr. Hampden to *Regius* professorship in Oxford—Dr. Wiseman, his studies in Rome—His work in England—Foundation of *Dublin Review*—*Remains* of Hurrell Froude—Wiseman's article on St. Augustine and the Donatists—Wiseman at Oscott—*Tract* 90—Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem—Dr. Russell and Newman—Two parties among Tractarians—Ward, Oakeley and Pusey—Newman's retirement to Littlemore—Ward's *Ideal of a Christian Church*—Ward and Convocation—Newman's *Essay on Development*—Submission to Rome—Position of the Converts . . 24–49

(*c*) *The Church in England from the Establishment of the Hierarchy* PAGE

The government by vicars—Establishment of hierarchy—Wiseman, Cardinal—Outburst of bigotry in England—Durham Letter—Lord John Russell and Ecclesiastical Titles Bill—Sketch of Manning's career—Appointment of Dr. Hampden—The Gorham trial—Manning, Gladstone, Wilberforce, Pusey—Newman's *Lectures on Anglican Difficulties*—Manning's conversion—Newman, Rector of Catholic University in Dublin—Work of Cardinal Wiseman—Disputes with Dr. Errington and Chapter of Westminster—Position of Manning in these controversies—Liberal Catholics in England—*The Rambler*, *Home and Foreign Review*, *Dublin Review*—Newman's *Apologia*—Newman and a Catholic Hall at Oxford—Death of Wiseman—Election of Manning—Newman's Grammar of Assent—Controversy on Papal Infallibility in England—Manning at the Vatican Council—Gladstone on *Vaticanism*—Newman's *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*—Manning's work as Archbishop—House of Higher Studies at Kensington—English Catholics and the national universities—Leo XIII. appoints Newman cardinal—Manning and the Labour problem—Death of Newman and Manning—Dr. Vaughan, Archbishop of Westminster—Anglican Orders controversy—Encyclical, *Apostolicae Curae*—Reception of the Papal decision—Catholic education in England—Organisation of English Catholics 49-76

(*d*) *Anglicanism*

Dependence of Anglican Church upon the State—Proposal of an Ecclesiastical Court of Appeal—Divorce—Controversies regarding the Blessed Eucharist—Liberal or Broad Church Party in the Anglican Church—*Essays and Reviews*—The Colenso controversy—Ritualism—The A. P. U. C.—The *English Church Union* and the *Church Association*—Persecution of the Ritualists—Public Worship Regulation Act—The Lambeth Conference—Commission to investigate illegal practices in the Anglican Church. 76-86

(*e*) *The Church in Scotland*

Position of Catholics in Scotland after Culloden—Conversion and career of Dr. Hay—Outburst of bigotry in Scotland in 1778—Provision for education of priests for Scotland—Scotch Catholics in 1800—Rapid increase owing to emigration from

PAGE

Ireland – Catholics in Glasgow—Scotch Catholics and Emancipation—Disputes amongst Catholics, especially in Glasgow—Interference of Propaganda—Settlement of controversy—Establishment of hierarchy in Scotland—Present position of Catholics in Scotland—Catholic education . . . 86 97

CHAPTER II

THE CHURCH IN IRELAND

(*a*) *The Repeal of the Penal Laws*

Improvement in position of Catholics during reign of George III.—Causes of this change of attitude – Danger to England, danger to landed interests, the growth of a more liberal spirit, influence of Burke and Grattan—The Catholics begin to assert themselves—The Irish Catholic merchants—Dr. Curry, Wyse and Charles O'Connor—First Catholic Committee—Dissensions—Quarterage—Relief Bills of 1771, 1774—Second Catholic Committee—Relief Bill of 1778—The Irish Parliament of the period—Efforts of the Opposition—The Volunteers—The attitude of their leaders towards Catholics—Independence of Irish Parliament—Reform movement did not include Catholic suffrage—Dublin Convention of 1783 and Catholics—Relief Act of 1782—Loss of interest in Catholic question between 1783 and 1790—Catholics and Presbyterian Reformers—Growth of democratic spirit—New leaders for Catholics, Keogh, Sweetman, Byrne, &c.—Contempt shown by both Government and Opposition for the Catholics in 1790-1—Union between democratic sections of Catholics and Presbyterians—Wisdom of this alliance—Opposed by Lord Kenmare—Secession of gentry from the Catholic Committee—The English Cabinet advises concessions to the Catholics—Relief Bill of 1792—The Catholic Convention of 1792—Catholic Delegates in England—Relief Bill of 1793—Government attacks the United Irishmen Society—Earl Fitzwilliam as Lord Lieutenant—Hopes of Catholics and Opposition—Disappointment at his recall—Pitt and the Union—Means employed to promote it—The Peep of Day Boys, Defenders, and United Irishmen—Clergy oppose the secret societies—Efforts of Government to excite a rebellion—Success of these efforts—Catholics and the Union . . 98–142

(*b*) *Ireland from the Union till Emancipation*

Plans for enslaving Catholic Church in Ireland—Payment of clergy and veto on the appointment of bishops—Burke and Hippisley on state interference—Reply of bishops to Government pro-

PAGE

posals in 1795—Dr. Troy and the veto—The trustees of Maynooth College and the veto—Pitt's betrayal of the Catholics—Emancipation in the English Parliament—Fingall and Dr. Milner as delegates of Irish Catholics in 1808—Ponsonby puts forward veto in its most extreme form—Outcry in Ireland against it—Bishops meet and reject it—The English Catholic Board and the veto—The veto controversy in Ireland—The vetoists negotiate with Canning—Canning's amendments in 1813—Opposed by Milner and Irish Catholic bishops—The English vicars and Catholic Board—The interference of Quarantotti—The Quarantotti rescript condemned by Irish bishops, clergy, and people—Irish bishops send representatives to Rome—Letter of Pius VII.—Strong action of Irish bishops—Delegates of bishops and of Catholic Committee in Rome—Second Letter of Pius VII.—End of the controversy—O'Connell and the Catholic Committee—Formation of the Catholic Assscіation—the Catholic Rent—Emancipation in the English Parliament—The Waterford election—Influence of the Forty-shilling Freeholders—Both parties stand ready for war—The Clare election—Surrender of Peel and the Duke of Wellington—The Emancipation Act—Its defects—Method of electing bishops in Ireland . . 142-173

(*c*) *From Emancipation till the Disestablishment*

Campaign of proselytism in Ireland—Agitation against the Tithes—History of Tithes in Ireland—Opposition of the House of Lords—Tithe Commutation Act, 1838—Relief of the Poor in Ireland—Commission of 1833 and report—English workhouse system introduced—Unfair working of the system—Reform of the Corporations—Catholics admitted—The Repeal agitation and the bishops—Influence of Dr. MacHale—The Charitable Bequests Bill—Controversies regarding it—Failure and death of O'Connell—Old Ireland and Young Ireland—Renewed schemes for payment of clergy—Intrigues at Rome—The Diplomatic Relations Bill—Rebellion and Famine—Dr. Cullen as archbishop of Armagh—Synod of Thurles and Irish landlordism—The Tenants' League—The Ecclesiastical Titles Bill—Its effects in Ireland—Strained relations between the Tenants' League and the Catholic Defence Association—Independent Opposition—Action of Keogh and Sadleir—Duffy, Lucas and Dr. MacHale denounce the betrayal—Attacks on Dr. Cullen—The Callan meeting—Lucas goes to Rome—Imprudent action of Duffy—Dr. Cullen and Lucas in Rome—Death of Lucas and end of the controversy—Protestant monopoly in Ireland—Ministers' money—Relief Bill of 1867—Agitation for Disestablishment—Gladstone supports Disestablishment—Measure carried—Generosity of English Parliament towards Irish Protestants 173-215

CHAPTER III

EDUCATION IN IRELAND

(*a*) *Primary Education* PAGE

Efforts to proselytise Irish Catholics through the schools—Parochial schools of Henry VIII. and Diocesan schools of Elizabeth—Erasmus Smith schools—Charter schools—Hibernian Military and Marine schools—Schools of Society for Discountenancing Vice—London Hibernian Society, Baptist Society Schools—State of Catholic Education—The Nuns and Christian Brothers—The Kildare Street Society—Statistics of Irish Primary schools—Catholic bishops and education system—National school system established—Opposed by Episcopalians—Presbyterians mould the system—Opposition of Dr. MacHale—Divisions among Irish bishops—Appeal to Rome—Decision—Influence of Dr. Cullen on Irish National system—Withdrawal of Whately from the Board—People favour denominational education—Demands of Irish bishops—Powis Commission and report of—The Model Schools and Training Colleges—Opposition to the Model Schools—Catholic Training Colleges—Unfair treatment of Catholic Training Colleges . 216-30

(*b*) *Secondary Education*

The Protestant schools—Free schools, Royal schools, Erasmus Smith schools—How supported and endowed—Catholics get no assistance for their schools—Money spent by Catholics on secondary education—Report of Census Commissioners, 1871—Necessity for State intervention—The Intermediate Act—Working of the Intermediate system 230-35

(*c*) *University Education*

Trinity College—Proposals of Mr. Wyse—The Queen's Colleges Bill—Suggestions of Irish bishops ignored—System condemned by the majority of Irish bishops—Appeal to Rome—Condemnation approved—Negotiations between Government and Dr. Murray—Second Roman condemnation—Appointment of Protestant staff to Colleges—Synod of Thurles and the Queen's Colleges—Project of founding a Catholic University—Newman appointed rector—Opening of University—Causes of failure—Want of funds and of a charter, want of sympathy of rector staff and university with their surroundings, dissensions among the governing body—Earl Russell's Supplementary Charter—Lord Mayo's proposals for a Catholic University—Gladstone's Bill of 1873—Fawcett's Act—The Royal University—Reconstruction of Catholic University—Royal Commission and report—Commission on Trinity College and report—Irish Universities Act of 1908—Net result of new legislation . 235-52

(*d*) *The Education of the Clergy* PAGE

The Irish Colleges in Rome, Spain and Portugal, the Netherlands, France—Destruction of these Colleges in the Revolution—Carlow College founded—Negotiations between Irish bishops and government—Act passed for establishment of a Catholic College—Maynooth founded—Establishment of a lay college at Maynooth—Opposition of government to lay college and its suppression—Origin of Dunboyne Establishment in Maynooth—Royal Commission on Maynooth—The increased grant—Maynooth cut adrift from the State—Its present constitution and position—The Missionary College of All Hallows, Dublin—Its foundation and its work—The Irish Colleges in Paris, Rome and Salamanca—Irish diocesan Colleges . . . 253-66

CHAPTER IV

THE CHURCH IN AMERICA—THE UNITED STATES

(*a*) *The Colonial and Federal Period*

The Spanish and French missions in the United States—Foundation of an English Catholic colony in Maryland—Position of Catholics in the colonies under the Protectorate and Restoration—Catholics and the War of Independence—New constitution and the Catholic religion—Negotiations for the appointment of a bishop—Opposition of the clergy—Father John Carroll appointed to see of Baltimore—His efforts to promote Catholic education—Introduction of religious orders—Synod of 1791—Increase of Catholic population—New dioceses established—First Provincial Council of Baltimore 267-78

(*b*) *Obstacles to the Progress of Catholicity*

System of lay trusteeship—How it arose in America—Abuses to which it led—Dr. Carroll and the lay trustees—Dr. Connolly, of New York, and the lay trustees—Dr. Egan and Dr. Conwell, of Philadelphia, and the system—Propaganda interferes in the Philadelphia dispute—Provincial council of Baltimore and ownership of ecclesiastical property—Dr. Hughes crushes trusteeism in New York—Dr. Kenrick equally successful in Philadelphia—Ownership of ecclesiastical property—State of civil laws in regard to such property—Stream of emigration from Ireland (1825-1850)—The emigrants disliked by the "Native Americans"—Attacks on Catholics in Philadelphia and Charleston—The disclosures of Maria Monk—Energetic action of Dr. Hughes prevents disturbance in New York—The formation of the "Know Nothing Party"—The American Protective Association—Public Opinion in America against such combinations 278-91

(*c*) *Development, Synods, Organisation* PAGE

Statistics of Catholic progress in the United States—Causes of such progress—Immigration and conversions—Success of the work begun by the Paulist Fathers—Synods of 1791, 1810, 1829, 1833, &c.—First Plenary Council of Baltimore—The Catholic Church and the civil war—Second Plenary Council of Baltimore—American bishops at the Vatican Council—Third Plenary Council of Baltimore—Method of appointing priests and bishops—Consultors 291–309

(*d*) *Catholic Education and Missions*

Catholic schools in Maryland—Organisation of Catholic schools in the different States—Nuns take charge of the schools—Dr. Hughes and the school controversy in New York—The public schools undenominational—System of Catholic schools organised—Decrees of the Plenary Councils regarding Catholic schools—Statistics of attendance at Parochial schools—Controversies regarding "Faribault system"—Secondary schools, statistics of—Provision for ecclesiastical education—Foundation of Catholic University in Washington—The Catholic Summer School—Missions to the Indians and Negroes 309 25

(*e*) *The Labour Question in the States and Later Developments*

The United States and the Labour Problem—Establishment of Trades Unions—The Knights of Labour—Rise of a Socialist party—Divisions—Socialism not well received—Centenary of the establishment of the hierarchy in the United States—National jealousies divide Catholics—Americanism . 325–35

(*f*) *The Church in Canada and Newfoundland*

Catholic religion in Canada under French rule—Bigotry of the English conquerors—Quebec Act of 1774—Influence of American War of Independence—Act of 1791—Irish in Canada—Clergy and the rebellion—Statistics of Catholic progress—The education question in Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba and North West Provinces—Secondary schools—University and ecclesiastical education—Irish Catholics in Newfoundland—Persecution of—Progress of Church in Newfoundland 336–49

(*g*) *The Church in Central and Southern America*

Mexico—Revolutions in—Persecution of Church—Reigns of Maximilian and Juârez—Separation of Church and State—Religious statistics—Church in Guatemala—Honduras—Salvador—Nicaragua—Costa Rica—Panama—Cuba—Haiti and San Domingo—Colombia—Venezuela—Ecuador—Peru—Chili—Paraguay—Argentina—Brazil 350–77

CHAPTER V

THE CHURCH IN AUSTRALASIA

(*a*) *The Catholic Church in Australasia* PAGE

Discovery of Australia—English penal colony at Botany Bay—Transportation of convicts from Ireland—First priests in Australia—Political convicts from Ireland—Government aims at Protestantising the colony—Expulsion of Father Flynn—Fathers Therry and Conolly volunteer for the Australian mission—Persecution less violent after 1829—Dr. Ullathorne in Australia—Dr. Polding appointed vicar apostolic—His arrival in Sydney—Irish priests respond to appeal for workers—Hierarchy established—Sydney the metropolitan see—Provincial Synod—Diocese of Perth—Melbourne established—Appointment of Dr. Carr to Melbourne—The church in South Australia—The church in Queensland—Continued progress in New South Wales—Work of Dr. Polding—Australian bishops and the Vatican Council—Dr. Moran of Ossory appointed to Sydney—His elevation to the Cardinalate—Holds First Plenary Council of Australia—Statistics for Sydney—Church in Tasmania—New Zealand—In the Islands 378-401

(*b*) *Synods, Organisation, Education*

Synod of 1844—Cardinal Moran presides at Plenary Councils 1885, 1895, 1905—Method of appointing to episcopal sees in Australia—Consultors—Position of rectors of parishes—Attempts of government to make education Protestant—System of education adopted—Public Instruction Bill of 1879—Catholics found their own schools—Education in Victoria—in Queensland, South Australia, West Australia—in New Zealand—Catholic secondary schools—University education in Australia and New Zealand 401-12

CHAPTER VI

THE CATHOLIC MISSIONS

Condition of the Catholic Missions at the beginning of century—Influence of Irish Catholic emigrants—Re-establishment of missionary colleges—Obstacles to the progress of the missions—Missions in British Colonies—India—South Africa—The Mauritius Islands—Gibraltar—The West Indies—in Western Asia—Followers of the different rites—China—Corea—Japan—Africa 413-35

CHAPTER VII

RELIGIOUS ORDERS AND CONGREGATIONS PAGE

Position of the religious orders at the beginning of the century—Their revival after the Revolution—The Benedictines—Their scholarship—The Cistercians—The Dominicans—The Society of Jesus—Its history and work during the century—The new religious orders and congregations of men and women . 436–43

CHAPTER VIII

THEOLOGICAL ERRORS AND DEVELOPMENTS

Jansenism—Its influence on Catholic theology—Gallicanism—Revival under Napoleon and the Restoration Government—Its opponents, de Bonald, de Maistre, de Lamennais, Montalembert, Lacordaire—Overthrow of Gallicanism—The *Aufklärung* movement in the German Empire—Febronianism—Schlegel, Stolberg, Görres—Traditionalism of de Bonald, Lamennais, Bautain, Bonnetty, Ubaghs—Ontologism—Gioberti—Rosmini—The German School—Hermes and Hermesianism—Günther—Froschammer—Ronge—Liberals and Conservatives—In France, Belgium, Germany—Congresses of Munich and Mechlin—Intervention of authority—Definition of the Immaculate Conception—The Syllabus—Infallibility—Later developments—Americanism—Reaction in favour of individualism—Modernism—Syllabus of Pius X. . . . 444–64

CHAPTER IX

ECCLESIASTICAL STUDIES IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Low condition of ecclesiastical science at the beginning of the century—Causes of this decline—Greatest danger in philosophy, Scripture and history—Revival of scholastic philosophy—Recommendations of Leo XIII.—Success of his work—Philosophical Institute founded at Louvain - Progress of Neo-Scholasticism in Belgium, Germany, France, Spain, Portugal, Hungary, England—Scripture studies—Neglect of in Catholic schools—De Wette, Bleek, Ewald, Reuss, Graf, Wellhausen—Strauss—Baur and the Tübingen school—Catholic scholars—Isenbiehl, Jahn, Mayer—

PAGE

Renan's *Life of Christ*—The Vatican Council—Controversies amongst Catholics—Views of Le Noir, Langen, Lenormant, Newman, Bartolo, Didiot, D'Hulst—Leo XIII. and Encyclical, *Providentissimus Deus*—Progress of Scriptural studies—Ecclesiastical History—Great revival—Causes of this revival—General histories of Church—Publication of sources—Patristic period—Archæology—History of the Papacy—Of the Councils—Of the Reformation period—Apologetics—System of de Maistre, Chateaubriand, Schlegel useful but not complete—French and German Schools—Immanent School—Principal Catholic Apologists—The comparative study of religions—Dogmatic theology—Neglect of at beginning of century—Application of historical method to dogmatic theology—Theory of Development—History of Dogma—Results of Higher Criticism as applied to theology—Moral Theology—Eradication of Jansenism—Closer study of ethics—Attention to sociology—Leading Moral Theologians of the century—Liturgy—Application of historical method to liturgical studies—Church Music—Revival of in Munich—in Ratisbon—Solesmes and the Plain Chant—Work of Dom Jausions and Dom Pothier—Pius X. and reform—Church Music in Ireland 465-89

CHAPTER X

ECCLESIASTICAL EDUCATION

Effects of French Revolution—The French seminaries under Napoleon and under the Restoration Government—The Catholic Institutes—Religious expelled from the seminaries—The universities *versus* the seminaries in Germany—Methods of educating the clergy—Provision for ecclesiastical education in Austria—Switzerland—Belgium—Italy—Spain—Portugal—Ireland, Scotland, England—The United States . . 490-97

CHAPTER XI

SOCIALISM

Magnitude of the Labour problem in the century—Causes which led to such a serious situation—Liberalism and Socialism—Theoretic Socialism—Scientific Socialism—Marx and Lassalle—Foundation of the International—Anarchists and Socialists—Marxists and Possibilists—Progress of Socialism in Germany—Austria—France—Italy—Spain and Portugal—The United States, England 498-510

CHAPTER XII

THE CATHOLIC LABOUR MOVEMENT PAGE

Interest of Catholic Church in the Labour question—Precursors of modern Catholic Democratic party—Work of Ketteler, Bishop of Mayence—His views on the solution of Labour problem—The German Catholic School of Economists—Catholic Labour organisation in Austria—in Switzerland—in France—in Belgium—in Italy—Cardinal Manning and the American and Irish bishops—Efforts to unify the movement—Leo XIII. and the *Rerum Novarum*—Reception accorded to the Papal Encyclical on Labour—Progress of Catholic or Christian Democracy in Germany—in Austria—in Switzerland—in Belgium . 511-24

INDEX 525-74

History of the Catholic Church

IN THE

Nineteenth Century

CHAPTER I

THE CHURCH IN GREAT BRITAIN

(*a*) The Repeal of the Penal Laws in England (1778-1829)

Ward, *The Dawn of the Catholic Revival in England*, 1781-1803, 2 vols., London, 1909. Amherst, *The History of Catholic Emancipation*, 1771-1820, 2 vols., London, 1886. Butler, *Historical Memoirs of English, Irish and Scottish Catholics*, 3rd ed., 4 vols., London, 1822. Milner, *Supplementary Memoirs*, London, 1820. Husenbeth, *Life of Milner*, Dublin, 1862. Ward, *Catholic London a Century Ago* London, 1905.

The Catholic population of England at the time of the passing of the first Relief Bill was about 60,000, 25,000 of whom were in the London district, 20,000 in the Northern, 9,000 in the Midland, and over 3,000 in the Western district. The Church was governed by four vicars apostolic, between whom England was divided into the four above-mentioned districts, while the total number of clergy at work on the mission probably reached close on 350. The Catholic body was composed of native English Catholics, many of whom belonged to the nobility and wealthy classes, and of Irish immigrants, who at this period were settled for the most part in London. The total number of Catholic Irish in London was between 4,000 and 5,000, and in the rest of England about 2,000 or 3,000.*

* Amherst, Vol. I., p. 77.

Centuries of persecution had succeeded in crushing the spirit of the Catholics, and in driving them out of the public life of the country. Educated at home or in some of the great English colleges on the Continent, the sons of the nobility and of the higher classes returned to spend their days in seclusion, glad if, by escaping notice, they could escape persecution. The public spirit in England, though gradually becoming more tolerant, could not prevent persecution so long as the law encouraged the trade of informers, and, as a result, the clergy were in a state of perpetual anxiety, liable to vexatious prosecutions every time they exercised the functions of their office.

The Relief Act of 1778 was the first step on the road to complete emancipation. It abolished the reward of £100 to informers against priests and schoolmasters, as well as the punishment of perpetual imprisonment to which these two classes were liable on conviction. But the clauses of the Act of 1581 against saying or hearing Mass still remained in force. The Act, furthermore, allowed Catholics to hold real property, and to acquire it by purchase or inheritance, and it abolished the right of the nearest Protestant heir to lay claim to the estates of his Catholic parents or relatives. In spite, however, of these concessions the Catholic disabilities were sufficiently discouraging. Any act of religion, or any attempt at education, exposed Catholics to severe penalties; they were excluded from the House of Lords and the House of Commons, from the Bar, from the exercise of the Parliamentary franchise, and from commissions in the army and navy, while the operation of the clauses regarding enrolment of their estate deeds, and the double land tax which they were obliged to pay, brought home to them their social inferiority.

The Act as passed did not extend to Scotland, and the proposal that similar toleration should be conceded to Scotch Catholics roused a regular storm of opposition. The Presbyterian synods protested against such a concession to Popery; a solemn fast was proclaimed in

Glasgow; the preachers did not hesitate to use their pulpits for the purpose of stirring up religious bitterness, and, as a result, anti-Catholic riots broke out in Glasgow and Edinburgh. The Catholic churches were wrecked, and the houses and property of well-known Catholic merchants were in a great measure destroyed. The Scotch Catholics appealed to Parliament for compensation, and their petition was presented to the House of Commons by Edmund Burke (1779). The petition was supported by the King, George III., and was well received by the members of both parties. Lord George Gordon alone resisted the motion for compensation, and the general feeling seemed to be that an Act of toleration should also be passed for Scotland.

Lord George Gordon, disappointed by the attitude of Parliament, resolved to appeal to the anti-Catholic prejudices of the London mob. He announced his intention of presenting an anti-Catholic petition to the House of Commons on 2nd June, 1780, and invited those who favoured such a motion to meet him on that day in St. George's Fields, and to accompany him to the Parliament House. The mob assembled to the number of 60,000 or more, and invaded the approaches to the House of Commons, attacking not alone the Catholics they met on the march, but also the members of the House of Lords and House of Commons who were supposed to be friendly to Catholic interests. From Friday evening till the following Wednesday night London appeared to be at the mercy of the mob. The Catholic chapels were burned as well as the houses of the prominent Catholics, and of those members of the House of Lords or Commons who had taken an active part in promoting the Relief Bill. The magistrates could not be found, and as a consequence, the military stood by, unable or unwilling to offer any effective resistance; while it was with great difficulty the Catholic clergy succeeded in restraining their people, especially the Irish Catholics, from engaging in what would have proved a bloody and hopeless struggle. At last, George III., disgusted at the

conduct of the London magistrates, took the matter in hands himself, and issued a proclamation ordering the military to put down lawlessness without awaiting the directions of civil magistrates. This was on Wednesday, 7th June, and on that night the soldiers relentlessly carried out his instructions by firing on the mob, killing one hundred in the streets and wounding two hundred and fifty of the rioters. Such a display of vigour terrified Lord George Gordon and his followers, and the riots immediately ceased.

For some time the Catholic question remained in abeyance. But in 1782 a meeting of Catholics was called to elect a Catholic Committee. It was attended by about 30 Catholics, most of them being noblemen, and they elected four laymen, who, together with five representatives of the ecclesiastical districts (the Northern district being allowed two representatives) were to take charge of Catholic interests in England. Charles Butler, a distinguished Catholic conveyancer, was appointed secretary to the Committee. From the very beginning the Catholic Committee was distrusted by some of the vicars apostolic and by a large body of the clergy and of the Catholic laity of England The reason for this distrust may be sought for not in the fact that the members of the Committee were not personally above reproach, but rather because they represented in England the liberal, Cisalpine, anti-Papal party, which had made itself felt at this period in the Continental countries. Anxious to share in the rights of English citizens, and to prove their loyalty to the House of Hanover, they were not unwilling to join with the Protestants in denouncing the interference of the Papacy in matters not strictly spiritual, and to take the management of Catholic affairs out of the hands of the ultramontane bishops and clergy, whom they considered dangerous to the cause of English Catholic liberty. Their first step, namely, to demand an ecclesiastical government by regularly constituted bishops rather than by vicars apostolic, the former being more acceptable to the

government, was not calculated to allay the apprehensions of the bishops or clergy. In fact the Committee soon arrogated to itself the right to conduct Catholic affairs independently of the bishops, and to inquire into the conduct of the bishops, as is proved by the demand addressed by them to the vicars apostolic (1787) about a decision obtained by them from the Propaganda in regard to the temporalities of the ex-Jesuits in England.*

The Committee was elected for five years, and on the approach of the second election (1787) they issued an address dealing principally with the restoration of the hierarchy. In this document they pointed out that government by vicars was opposed to the statutes of *Praemunire* and *Provisors,* and that it would be much more advantageous if the bishops were chosen by the flock whom they were to teach, "and in conjunction with which they would be competent to regulate every part of the national church discipline." † Such sentiments, put forward by Catholic laymen, were a sufficient justification of the attitude of distrust adopted by the vicars and by the great body of the clergy. A new Committee was elected in 1787, and the following year a change was introduced by the co-option of three clergymen, Dr. James Talbot, Vicar of the London district, Dr. Berington, Coadjutor of the Midland district, and Rev. Joseph Wilkes, a Benedictine monk. These three were chosen without consultation with the clergy, and because it was thought that they favoured the views of the Committee.

In 1788, a deputation from the Catholic Committee waited upon Mr. Pitt, the Prime Minister, in reference to the introduction of a new Relief Bill. Either on the suggestion of the Committee or on that of Mr. Pitt it was resolved to send a series of questions on the "Dispensing Power" of the Pope to the Universities of Paris, Louvain, Douay, Alcala, Valladolid and Salamanca. Besides, on the advice of Lord Stanhope, the friend of the Dissenters, who was also favourable to Catholic

* Ward, Vol. I., pp. 104-7.
† *Idem.*, p. 109.

interests, they resolved to issue a "Protestation" in which some of the tenets falsely imputed to their body should be solemnly disclaimed. The Protestation * is said to have been drawn up, at least in its first form, by Lord Stanhope himself; and the references to the dispensing power of the Pope and his Infallibility are of such a character as might be expected from a Protestant rather than from a body of educated Catholic laymen. The Protestation was sent to the individual vicars, who, after considerable delay, signed it with great reluctance and only conditionally. The same persuasive arts were used with the clergy and laity, so that in the end the Protestation received about 1,500 signatures, of which 240 were those of clergymen.

The Protestation was changed into the form of a petition to Parliament (1789), and in this form was signed only by the members of the Committee. The petitioners there described themselves as the "Catholic Dissenters of England," a title which naturally gave great offence to their co-religionists. Apparently, in the course of the negotiations with Pitt, it was suggested that in view of the new concessions about to be made to the Catholics a new form of Catholic oath, more explicit than that of 1778, should be adopted. The Committee accepted the suggestion, and prepared a new oath to be taken by Catholics wishing to avail themselves of the new privileges. They embodied the oath in the draft of a Catholic Relief Bill which they prepared, but in which most of the Catholic disabilities were re-enacted, so that it read more like a new penal law than a measure of relief; while, besides, Catholics who agreed to take the oath were designated in the text of the measure as "Protesting Catholic Dissenters."

The new oath was decidedly objectionable in form. Besides declaring the "deposing power" of the Pope to be "impious," "heretical," and "damnable," it declared that no foreign prince had any spiritual authority that could directly or indirectly affect the independence,

* Butler, Vol. IV., pp. 19-24.

sovereignty, constitution or laws of the kingdom, that neither the Pope nor any ecclesiastical power could absolve or dispense in any oath, or compact whatsoever, and that the Pope was not infallible.

A meeting of the vicars was convened at Hammersmith on 19th October, 1789. Before that date Charles Butler, the secretary of the Committee, sent to each of the vicars the "Red Book" (so called from the colour of the binding), giving a full history of the oath and the Bill of Relief. The vicars met and unanimously condemned the oath, the title "Protesting Catholic Dissenters" and other clauses against "Papist" education, and religious trusts.* Drs. Walmseley and Gibson issued a pastoral bringing the condemnation under the notice of the faithful, but the brothers Talbot, vicars of the London and Midland districts, refused, for motives of prudence, to follow their example. The Committee put forth a strongly worded reply to the published condemnation, and this, together with other documents, was sent around in pamphlet form. This forms the first of the "Blue Books" of the Catholic Committee.

While the dispute was raging Dr. James Talbot, Vicar of the London district, died (Jan., 1790), and the friends of the Catholic Committee determined to secure the appointment of their supporter, Dr. Berington, to the vacant see. Sixty of the clergy of the district met, and thirty-nine of them voted that Dr. Berington's name should be placed first on the list of three candidates to be presented to the Holy See. The Catholic Committee organised a petition of laymen to be forwarded on his behalf to the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda. Two pamphlets were issued by Mr. Throckmorton to prove that the clergy and people had the right of appointing bishops without reference to Rome,† and replies were published by Dr. Milner and the Rev. Charles Plowden, both of whom were strong opponents of the Committee. Dr. Walmseley objected to the appointment of Dr.

* Ward, Vol. I., pp. 175-6.
† *Idem.*, p. 227.

Berington, and in the end Dr. Douglass, the priest designated by the late vicar, was selected by the Propaganda (22nd Aug., 1790). Several of the Committee and their friends declared that they would never acknowledge Dr. Douglass as their bishop, but the timely intervention of Dr. Berington induced them to recede from this ill-judged resolution.

Drs. Walmseley, Gibson, and Douglass agreed to issue a second condemnation of the oath, and accordingly in January, 1791, a pastoral letter signed by these three bishops was read in the churches of their dioceses. Dr. Thomas Talbot, of the Midland district, refused to attach his signature to this document. A reply to this pastoral was circulated by the Committee, and after some painful efforts at conciliation it was decided by that body to issue the "Manifesto and Appeal" which was written by Rev. Joseph Wilkes. This was undoubtedly a scandalous production, un-Catholic in its tone, and utterly subversive of episcopal authority. It can hardly be wondered at, therefore, that Dr. Walmseley suspended the author of it from the exercise of his priestly functions. This suspension roused the friends of the Committee, who regarded it as only another example of episcopal tyranny, and "the Staffordshire clergy," who had already declared their adhesion to the Committee, prepared a written protest to be signed by all the clergy of England.

While matters were in this state the discussions upon the Catholic Relief Bill opened in Parliament. The vicars were in complete ignorance of the nature of the negotiations carried on between the Committee and the ministers, but they took steps to bring their objections against the Bill, especially against the oath and the distinction proposed to be drawn between "Protesting Catholic Dissenters" and "Papists," under the notice of the prominent members of Parliament. Dr. Milner came up from Winchester to work against the Committee, and both by his pamphlets and by his personal interviews did much to correct false notions about the

exact position of the bishops, clergy and laity who opposed the designs of the Committee. The name "Protesting Catholic Dissenters" was changed into "persons professing the Roman Catholic Religion," but the terms of the oath were changed so as to make it more obnoxious to loyal Catholics. When the bill left the House of Commons (20th April, 1791) the position was extremely serious. It looked as if, henceforth, there were to be two classes of Catholics, one led by the vicars unwilling to take the oath, and, hence, excluded from the privileges of the bill, the other led by the Committee prepared to accept the oath, and entitled to the benefits of the new legislation.

The vicars were alarmed at the danger of schism, and put forth all their efforts to secure some amendments in the House of Lords. They appealed to the members of the House of Lords, and especially to the Anglican bishops, to reject the proposed oath in favour of the Irish oath of 1778, and their appeal met with the thorough sympathy of one of the ablest of the Anglican prelates, Dr. Horsley, Bishop of St. David's. Owing mainly to his influence the oath was dropped, and in its place was put the Irish oath, which the vicars were willing to accept. Thus, the danger of schism was averted, and the new Relief Bill became law (10th June, 1791).

By the Act of 1791 it was provided that those who had taken the oath of allegiance could not be prosecuted for being Papists, nor for hearing or celebrating Mass, nor for being in holy orders, or belonging to a religious order. But it was provided that all churches to be recognised as legal places for religious worship should be registered at the Quarter Sessions, and should not be adorned with steeple or bell. On the question of education the clauses of the Act seemed to be self-contradictory. It was enacted that no schoolmaster who had taken the oath could be prosecuted for teaching or instructing youth, provided he did not receive into his school the child of any Protestant father, but by another clause the foundation of any school, academy, or college by

Catholics was forbidden. The trusts and bequests for purposes which, before 1791, were regarded as superstitious and unlawful, continued to be so regarded. Catholics were allowed to practise as counsellors, barristers, attorneys, &c., and one of the first to be called to the Bar under this clause was Charles Butler, the secretary to the Catholic Committee. Catholics, however, were still excluded from the House of Lords and the House of Commons, from the exercise of the parliamentary franchise, from holding commissions in the army and navy, from the offices of judge, or king's counsel, and from all offices of trust under the Crown. All Catholic marriages must still be celebrated in a Protestant church, the Protestant service must still be read by a minister of the Established Church at all funerals, and the double land tax on Catholic landowners was still strictly enforced.

Though the Act was passed, the dissensions amongst the Catholics themselves still continued. A general meeting of the Catholic body was called in London (9th June, 1791), and after a heated discussion a vote of thanks was passed to the Committee.* A letter from the Staffordshire clergy in favour of Rev. Joseph Wilkes was discussed at length, and it was resolved to petition Dr. Walmseley to remove the suspension. The vicars resented warmly the "Manifesto and Appeal," and the "Blue Books" that had been issued by the Committee, while, on the other side, the Committee complained bitterly, and with some reason, of the pamphlets written by Dr. Milner and the Rev. Charles Plowden on behalf of the bishops. A body of Catholic gentlemen, known as the "Gentlemen Mediators," undertook to bring about an understanding between the vicars and the Committee, but for one reason or another their efforts were doomed to disappointment (1792). After years of negotiation the difficulty about Rev. Joseph Wilkes was settled by his retirement from England, and the remnant of the Staffordshire clergy, with one exception, made their submission to Dr. Stapleton in 1801.

* Ward, Vol. I., p. 319.

The Catholic Committee as such was dissolved in 1792, but a new club was formed in the same year, the Cisalpine Club, which adopted most of the principles of the Committee, and which was joined by a great many of its members. They continued to take part in Catholic affairs, especially in the foundation of a Catholic school, but the great body of the Catholics regarded them with the greatest distrust. A rival association, under the title of the Roman Catholic Meeting, was established in London (1794), but though it started well it soon practically disappeared. After 1795, when the Rev. Joseph Wilkes closed his connection with the Cisalpine Club, it gradually ceased to take any part in public affairs, and became a merely social assembly which lasted during the first quarter of the nineteenth century.

The outbreak and progress of the French Revolution were watched in England with considerable alarm. Mainly owing to the influence of Burke, and especially of his work, *Reflections on the French Revolution*, the sympathy of the English nation was decidedly on the side of the Royalists, and hence many of the *Émigrés* nobles, obliged to choose between disloyalty or exile, fled to England for refuge. Besides the bond of sympathy between England and the Royalists there was also a close connection between the English Catholics and the French. The clergy and sons of the English Catholic nobility were, as a rule, educated in France; many of the English colleges abroad were situated in French territory, and not a few English communities were involved in the same disasters as their French Catholic brethren.*

Hence, even during the year 1789, a few of the clergy fled to England, and their numbers were gradually increased in 1790 and 1791 through the operation of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. But it was not till September, 1792, that the great exodus of the clergy took place. By a decree of September, 1792, they were obliged

* For French clergy in England, *cf.*:—Sicard, *L'Ancien Clergé de France*, Vol. III., Chap. I. Ward, Vol. II., Chap. XIX., XXVII., XXXI.

either to take the oath or to leave France. Most of the clergy of Brittany and Normandy escaped to England from different French seaports. In the first month after this decree fully 3,000 priests and 16 bishops were thrown upon the English coast without any means of support, and dependent entirely upon English hospitality. The Catholics tried to assist them, and the vicar apostolic of the London district appealed for assistance.

But all their efforts would have been of little avail had not the Protestants of England generously rallied to the support of the exiles. The Marquis of Buckingham and Mr. John Wilmot led the way by organising a Relief Committee, which was composed of the leading English statesmen, both Whigs and Tories. In response to this appeal £33,775 were immediately subscribed. The royal palace of Winchester was placed at the disposal of the French clergy, and, at one time, as many as 600 found shelter there and formed a real French community. Lodgings were provided for others in London and in different parts of England, and the doors of many of the noblemen's castles were thrown open to receive the unfortunate priests and lay exiles. The University of Oxford printed an edition of the Vulgate for the use of the clergy, who arrived for the most part without any luggage except their breviaries, while another edition of 2,000 copies was distributed by the Marquis of Buckingham.

In response to a second appeal from the Committee an additional subscription of £41,304 was quickly raised, and, as the Royalist cause was daily growing more desperate, it was resolved that Parliament must be called upon to provide some fixed source of support. On the motion of the Prime Minister, Mr. Pitt, a sum of £200,000 was voted for the support of the French exiles, lay and cleric. At this period fully 5,000 French priests were in England or Jersey, not to speak of the nuns, mostly English, who had also fled to England from France. Many French chapels were opened in London, and in the neighbouring district a school was established

for the education of the French boys, and a seminary was opened to provide a supply of priests for France when better days should arrive.

In 1797, the Directory invited the clergy to return, and a few accepted the invitation, but this liberal policy was soon changed, and the majority were obliged to remain in England till 1800. In the beginning of that year about 5,600 priests were in receipt of pensions from the English Government, but towards the end of the year the numbers returning to France had been so great that only about 560 were still dependent upon the Relief Committee. Practically all, clergy and nobility, left England after the peace of Amiens in 1802. Of the bishops in England at the conclusion of the concordat 14 refused to resign their dioceses at the request of Pius VII. The leader in this refusal, which was inspired by political motives, was Dr. Dillon, the bishop of Narbonne, but though they refused to resign their dioceses the majority offered no opposition to the new administration organised by the Papal Legate, Caprara.

The influx of the French clergy into England had a great influence on the position of the English Catholics. The very presence of these priests in such large numbers, and the national enthusiasm which was stirred up on their behalf, helped to allay the suspicion and anxiety with which Catholics were regarded by their Protestant fellow-citizens. The exiled clergy were, as a rule, men of good education, who, both in their conversations and their behaviour, were well fitted to make a favourable impression on all classes of society. Many of them were employed as tutors in the homes of Protestant families, and had, thus, a favourable opportunity of showing how unwarrantable were the charges generally levelled against the Catholic clergy. Their presence, too, had a good effect on the Catholic body itself. It enabled the vicars to establish more churches and missions, and it helped to re-introduce into England the old Catholic ceremonies and customs which years of persecution had caused to disappear.

The English colleges and establishments on the Continent suffered much during the Revolution. Douay and St. Omers, the two great colleges for the education of English boys, were practically laid waste (1793), and the communities of English nuns in France and in the Netherlands shared the same fate. The English College in Rome was also seized and the students disbanded during the occupation of Rome by General Berthier in 1798. It was necessary, therefore, to provide means of education in England, and in 1793 Old Hall was opened by Dr. Douglass under the patronage of St. Edmund of Canterbury. Stonyhurst was established by the ex-Jesuits of Liège in 1794, Oscott about the same period, and Crook Hall in 1794. This latter college was changed to Ushaw in 1808. The Benedictines settled at Ampleforth in Yorkshire in 1803, and the St. Gregory community in Acton Burnell, whence they removed to Downside in 1814. A great many foundations for English nuns on the Continent were suppressed, and the sisters returned to England, where, after the year 1794, several convents were established. Some Protestants were so much alarmed at the growth of such institutions that a bill was brought into the House of Commons (1800) to prevent novices being received in such houses, and to subject the convents to public inspection. The bill passed through the House of Commons, but in the House of Lords Dr. Horsley again came to the relief of the Catholics, and the bill was adjourned for three months, or, in other words, it was abandoned.

The story of the struggle for Catholic Emancipation is more fittingly told in connection with the ecclesiastical history of Ireland. The English Catholics, few in numbers compared with their co-religionists in Ireland, and divided as they were into two distinct groups, were unable to contribute much to the struggle; and, hence, the complete treatment of the subject is reserved for the following chapter. Here, it will be sufficient to indicate the most striking events in the campaign for emancipation carried on by the English Catholics themselves.

After the resignation of Pitt in 1801 very little was done in England for a few years. In the year 1808 the Catholic Board was formed. It represented in a great measure the policy of the Catholic Committee, except that it placed the vicars apostolic upon the standing committee, and invited the clergy of England to assist in the struggle by becoming members of the Board. The question of the veto on the appointment of Catholic bishops was already a burning one, and while the members of the Board rather favoured the idea of giving the government some voice in the appointment of their vicars, Dr. Milner, the former opponent of the Committee, took up an attitude of strong opposition to such a policy. He had been appointed vicar of the Midland district, and acted as the agent of the Irish bishops in London. Though at first personally not unfavourable to allowing the government a negative voice in the appointment of bishops, he changed his mind, owing probably to the instructions of the Irish bishops, and determined to oppose all such concessions.

In January, 1810, Lords Grey and Grenville received a deputation from the English Catholic body. These two gentlemen urged strongly the view that in return for emancipation the Catholics should give further security for their loyalty, and though the veto on the appointment of bishops was not expressly agreed upon, lest the Irish Catholics should take offence, yet it was generally understood that a negative voice in the appointment of bishops was the only security that could be offered or accepted. The members of the deputation retired and drew up a resolution to be laid before a general meeting of the Catholics, and as this is what was afterwards known as the "Fifth Resolution," that caused so much discussion, it is well to give it in its entirety. It was resolved "that the English Roman Catholics, in soliciting the attention of Parliament to their petition, are actuated, not more by a sense of hardships and disabilities under which they labour than by a desire to secure, on the most solid foundations, the peace and harmony

of the British Empire; and to obtain for themselves opportunities of manifesting, by the most active exertions, their zeal and interest in the common cause, in which the country is engaged, for the maintenance of its freedom and independence; and that they are firmly persuaded that adequate provision for the maintenance of the civil and religious establishment of this kingdom may be made, consistently with the strictest adherence, on their part, to the tenets and discipline of the Roman Catholic religion; and that any arrangement founded on this basis of mutual satisfaction and security, and extending to them the full enjoyment of the civil constitution of their country, will meet with their grateful concurrence." *

Shortly afterwards a meeting of the English Catholics was held to draft a petition to Parliament. It met on the 1st February, 1810. There were present about one hundred gentlemen, amongst them being Dr. Milner, Vicar of the Midland district, Dr. Poynter, Coadjutor of Dr. Douglass, Vicar of the London district, and Dr. Collingridge, Vicar of the Western district. The first four resolutions were passed unanimously, but the "Fifth Resolution" was strongly opposed by Dr. Milner, both as being offensive to the Irish Catholics, who objected to the veto in any form, and as fraught with danger to the future of the Catholic religion in England. In spite of the arguments of Dr. Milner, the Fifth Resolution was passed, and was embodied in a supplement to the petition; and, what is still more remarkable, the petition was signed by all the other bishops, Drs. Douglass, Collingridge, Gibson and Poynter.† Thus, a step had been taken which was likely to divide the English and Irish Catholics into two hostile parties, and even to introduce dissensions into the English Catholic body itself. Fortunately for all parties, the House of Commons and the House of Lords both declared against the Catholics in 1810 by large majorities.

* Butler, Vol. IV., pp. 166-7.
† Milner, *Supp. Memoirs*, pp. 146-160.

In 1811, the Catholic petition was again defeated in the House of Lords and the House of Commons, but in the following year a motion made by Mr. Canning in the House of Commons, that Parliament should take into consideration the state of the laws regarding Roman Catholics early in the next session, was passed by 235 against 106, whilst a similar resolution, proposed by the Marquis of Wellesley in the Chamber of Peers, was lost by only one vote. It looked as if the triumph of the Catholic cause in the next session of Parliament was assured.

In the same year (1812) a meeting of the English vicars was held at Durham (21st Aug.). The division between Dr. Milner and the other bishops still continued, and was accentuated by the fact that faculties had been granted in the London district to the Abbé Trevaux, who was justly suspected of favouring the schismatical party known as *La Petite Église,* by Dr. Poynter, in opposition to the well-known wishes of the vicar of the Midlands. Dr. Moylan, bishop of Cork, assisted by Dean M'Carthy, attended the meeting in order to bring about an understanding between the English and Irish bishops on the question of the veto. The attempt at reconciliation completely failed. While Dr. Moylan, supported by Dr. Milner, strongly urged the bishops to protest against any change in the method of appointing bishops, that is to say, against the veto proposals, the others would agree to no formula except that all, Irish and English Catholics, were "of one faith, and one communion." In these circumstances the meeting broke up without having done anything to heal the dissensions within the Catholic ranks.*

In February, 1813, Grattan opened the campaign for Catholic Emancipation by proposing that the House should resolve itself into a Committee to consider the laws affecting Roman Catholics, and after a four days' discussion the motion was carried by 264 against 224. In March, the same friend of the Catholic cause pro-

* Milner, *Supp. Memoirs,* pp. 183-90.

posed that for the peace of the kingdom it was highly advisable to provide for the removal of the civil and military disabilities of the Catholics, with such exceptions and regulations as might be deemed necessary to secure the Protestant succession, and the established churches in England, Ireland and Scotland. This resolution, too, was carried by 186 against 119. Grattan followed up these resolutions by introducing the Catholic Relief Bill on 30th April, 1813, which passed the first reading without any opposition. It received the second reading on the 13th May, the motion proposed by Dr. Duigenan that "the Bill be read this day three months" being rejected by 245 against 203. The bill had, therefore, safely reached the Committee stage.

But some of the English statesmen who favoured Catholic Emancipation were still strongly convinced that in return for such a favour Catholics should offer more complete guarantees for their future loyalty. Mr. Canning was the spokesman of such a party, and unfortunately Canning was in communication with Charles Butler, the former secretary of the Catholic Committee. Whether the amendments proposed by Canning were suggested by Butler or not, they embodied Butler's views so perfectly that the latter can hardly be absolved from having had some share in their preparation. Mr. Canning proposed that a certain number of commissioners be appointed, Catholics who were lay peers of Great Britain and Scotland, and who possessed estates of at least one thousand a year. These commissioners were to be nominated by the Crown, and were to take an oath for the faithful discharge of the duties of their office, and the observance of secrecy. Whenever a priest was elected for a vacant bishopric in Great Britain, or Scotland, he should notify his election to these commissioners, who should notify it in turn to the Privy Council, together with a certificate of loyalty if they had no reason for believing the contrary, but if the commissioners had such reasons they should refuse to grant a

certificate of character. Those only who received such certificates from the commissioners were capable of exercising episcopal functions within the United Kingdom, and if any person not having received such a certificate dared to exercise episcopal jurisdiction, he should be adjudged guilty of a misdemeanour, and expelled from the country.

A similar commission, consisting of the above-mentioned commissioners, together with the Lord Chancellor, or Lord Keeper, or First Commissioner of the Great Seal, one of the principal Secretaries of State, being a Protestant, or some Protestant member of the Privy Council, and the vicar apostolic of London, should be established to examine papal documents coming into England and Scotland. Any person receiving any bull, dispensation, or other instrument from the Court of Rome, or from any of its officials, should send a copy of such a document to the commissioners within six weeks after its reception, except he made a declaration that it related only to spiritual concerns, and that it did not affect the allegiance or loyalty due to his majesty and government. All persons who acted on Papal instructions without having made such a notification were to be adjudged guilty of misdemeanour, and were liable to expulsion from the kingdom.

Had the bill been carried with such clauses embodied in it, it is clear that it would have had most dangerous consequences for the Catholic religion. Dr. Milner hastened to London to oppose the clauses of Canning and Castlereagh, but he soon found that the Catholic Board was of a different opinion, and that he could look for no support from Dr. Poynter, Vicar of the London district. He prepared hurriedly a *Brief Memorial*, containing the principal objections from the Catholic point of view against the embodiment of these clauses, and his memorial was printed and circulated among the members of Parliament. In spite of his unsupported efforts, the bill would probably have passed in its amended form had not Mr. Abbot, the Speaker of the

House of Commons, proposed in the committee stage that the first clause, giving the Catholics the right to sit and vote in the House of Parliament, should be omitted from the measure. The amendment was carried by a majority of four, and as this amendment destroyed the very essence of the bill, its promoters determined to drop it, and await some more favourable time.

A meeting of the Catholic Board was convened for the 29th May, 1813, and Milner was invited to attend. A resolution was proposed disclaiming responsibility for the *Brief Memorial*, and condemning it. Dr. Milner defended the substance and tone of the document, and after some warm interchanges between himself and Charles Butler the resolution was carried with only two dissentients. It was next proposed that the name of Dr. Milner should be struck off the list of members of the select committee of the Catholic Board. This, too, was carried, and Dr. Milner, accompanied by his two supporters, Mr. Weld of Lulworth and Mr. Bodenham, left the assembly.* At the time when Dr. Milner was receiving such treatment from his co-religionists in England the Irish bishops, clergy, and people were passing resolutions approving of his conduct, and guaranteeing him their thorough support.

It was felt by the Catholic Board and their supporters that something must be done to counteract the effect of the condemnation of the veto proposals passed by the Irish bishops, and supported by Dr. Milner. Whether the scheme was suggested by Charles Butler or not is not clear, but it was arranged that a meeting of the vicars apostolic of England and Scotland should be held at Durham (Oct., 1813). Dr. Milner was not invited to attend, as some of the prelates had expressed their unwillingness to meet him in conference. A pastoral was issued by Dr. Gibson for the Northern district, and by Dr. Poynter for the London district, in which, though the Canning clauses received very mild disapprobation, the "Fifth Resolution" was explained

* Milner, *Supp. Memoirs*, pp. 211-13. Butler, Vol. IV., pp. 270-1.

and defended. Dr. Milner addressed a pastoral to the Catholics of the Midland district, in which he protested against his exclusion from the meeting of the vicars, and defended his own attitude of opposition to all such proposals of securities for Catholic loyalty and submission.

Meanwhile, steps were being taken by the opponents of Dr. Milner to secure an expression of opinion from Rome in favour of their policy. The Pope, Pius VII., was at this period a prisoner at Fontainebleau (June, 1812-Jan., 1814); the cardinals were banished from Rome, and were scattered through different cities of France and Italy, and the only man in Rome who had authority to interfere with English or Irish affairs was Monsignor Quarantotti, secretary to the Propaganda. His duty was to transact the ordinary routine business of the Congregation, and anything beyond this was an unwarrantable interference. Dr. Poynter brought the differences between himself and Dr. Milner under the notice of Monsignor Quarantotti, and the latter addressed a letter to Dr. Milner in February, 1813, setting out the complaints that had been made against him in Rome. The Irish bishops addressed a letter to Cardinal di Pietro, the Prefect of the Propaganda, in November, 1813, expressing their thorough approval of the policy of Dr. Milner.

But Dr. Poynter and his friends were determined to put down all opposition by obtaining the approval of Monsignor Quarantotti for the bill of 1813, which had been so strongly condemned by Dr. Milner and the Irish bishops. The agent of Dr. Poynter's faction in Rome was the Rev. P. MacPherson, rector of the Scotch College, who succeeded in inducing the secretary of the Propaganda to forward a rescript to Dr. Poynter, declaring that the Catholics ought to receive and embrace with satisfaction and gratitude the law which was proposed last year for their emancipation.* This rescript was dated the 14th February, 1814. Such a docu-

* Butler, Vol. IV., p. 171.

ment only served to increase the bitterness between the friends and opponents of the veto.

Dr. Milner determined to set out for Rome, where he might have an opportunity of submitting the whole controversy to the judgment of the Pope, who had been released from imprisonment. He received a very flattering reception from Pius VII. and many of the cardinals, and was asked to draw up a memorial to be presented to Cardinal Litta, to whose cognisance the dispute was referred. According to Dr. Milner's own narrative the Roman authorities, while warning him to be moderate in his controversies and mindful of the feelings of his opponents, expressed their complete approbation of his policy.* Meanwhile the Catholic Board was not idle in England. A general meeting of the Board was held in June, 1814, at which an address was prepared for presentation to the Holy Father, declaring the pleasure of the English Catholics at his return from exile, the pain they experienced owing to the attacks made upon them, as if they were apostates, by some of their own brethren, and the delight with which Catholics had received the rescript of Monsignor Quarantotti. They concluded this curious document by expressing their confidence that His Holiness would express his approval of the steps that had been taken by his representative in Rome. An answer was returned to this address in December, 1814, thanking the members of the Board for their good wishes, and announcing to them that the whole business of the rescript had been handed over to a congregation of the cardinals for a new and complete inquiry.

When the inquiry was finished Cardinal Litta, in the name of the Pope, announced the result in a letter to Dr. Poynter. It was dated 26th April, 1815, and was written from Genoa, whither Pius VII. had fled for protection after the escape of Napoleon from Elba. The cardinal declared that the three subjects on which the English government had shown anxiety were the oath of allegiance, the method of appointing bishops to vacant

* *Supp. Memoirs*, p. 231.

sees, and the *Exequatur,* or right of the government to examine all papal bulls, briefs, rescripts or instructions. In regard to the first point the cardinal proposed three different forms of oath which His Holiness would permit Catholics to take in case such an oath was necessary for emancipation. About the second subject, namely, the appointment of bishops, the Pope considered that the oath of allegiance to be taken by the bishops was sufficient security, but, at the same time, to provide ample satisfaction, he would allow the list of candidates for vacant sees to be presented to the king's ministers in order that the government might strike out the name of any obnoxious candidate, "care, however, being taken to leave a sufficient number for His Holiness to choose therefrom individuals whom he might deem best qualified in the Lord for governing the vacant churches." The third subject, namely, the *Exequatur,* was declared to be one which could not be made a matter for negotiation.* This letter was substantially a condemnation of the Quarantotti rescript. It was not in the nature of a command, but rather of a permission, and set forth the concessions to Protestant sentiment which the Pope was prepared to tolerate in exchange for emancipation. There is nothing in the letter inconsistent either with Catholic theology or the traditional policy of the Holy See.

Milner died in 1826 before the victory had been won. Though not always prudent in his methods, yet he had done much to save the Catholics of England from attempting to secure emancipation at the risk of schism, and if he did not live himself to reap the fruits of his long struggle, yet he had the consolation of knowing before his death that success was assured. The Catholic Association of Ireland was already in the field.

* Milner, *op. cit.*, pp. 234-37. Butler, Vol. IV., pp. 531-36.

(*b*) The Oxford Movement

Tracts for the Times, 6 vols., Oxford, 1833-41. Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, Oxford, 1864. Mozley, *Letters and Correspondence of Newman During his Life in the English Church*, 2 vols., London, 1891. Ward, *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman*, 2 vols., London, 1900. Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, 4 vols., London, 1894-98. Ward, *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement*, London, 1890. Church, *The Oxford Movement*, 1833-45, London, 1891. Browne, *History of the Tractarian Movement*, Dublin, 1856. Thureau-Dangin, *La Renaissance Catholique en Angleterre au XIX^e^ Siècle*, 3 vols., Paris, 1899-1906.

The condition of the Anglican Church during the first quarter of the nineteenth century could hardly be described as flourishing by even its warmest admirers. Like the Catholic Church in France before the Revolution, it was too closely bound up with the state to have much room for spiritual or religious activity. The Tory party had been in the ascendant for years, and the emoluments of the Established Church furnished them with one of the most fruitful sources for political patronage. The bishops, chosen for the most part either on account of their personal connections or scholarly attainments, had little care for the spiritual welfare of the flock committed to their charge, while the higher clergy, influenced by the example of their superiors, delegated their work to underpaid assistants. The clerical state was adopted by most of the aspirants only on account of its social and pecuniary attractions; and the result was, as in France, a gradual decline in the religious life of the nation, accompanied by a widespread contempt for the ministers of religion.

The Evangelical party in the Church, taking their cue from the Methodists, had done something to revive the spiritual activity of certain sections in the Church, but in the first quarter of the nineteenth century their influence for good was fast disappearing, and it was evident that no reform of the Anglican Church could be expected from such a quarter. It was towards the

University of Oxford, the *Alma Mater* of so many of the distinguished English clergy and laity that many thinking men looked for a new lead, and the new lead was given them in the rise of the Liberal school. The leaders of the Liberal school were Whately, afterwards archbishop of Dublin,* but then fellow of Oriel College, and his colleague, Thomas Arnold, who accepted the responsible post of head master at Rugby in 1827. Both men were more anxious about the practical rather than the dogmatic side of religion, and both regarded the High Church party with mingled feelings of pity and contempt; but the Liberalism of Arnold, scornful of sacerdotalism, and of ecclesiastical independence, was of a more pronounced type than that of Whately.

The latter, putting aside the restraint of dogmatic formulas, and of Church authority, was anxious to test religious truth by the light of reason, and to accept its dictate as the only safe religious guide. The teaching of the Fathers and the writings of theologians were regarded by him as of little importance, and while holding fast to his belief in the Anglican Church, he reserved to himself the right to interpret the articles of her creed after his own fashion, and to reject as unimportant those of them not clearly in harmony with the judgments of his reason. But Dr. Whately was strong in upholding the existence of a Church as a distinct and visible body, and its independence of state authority. To these two men, Whately and Arnold, Oxford is much indebted for the literary and religious revival in which the university played such a prominent part, and which, at one time, threatened to be entirely Liberal in its tendencies.

But the old High Church traditions of the Stuart dynasty still survived and found supporters in this great conservative seat of learning. John Keble,† also a fellow of Oriel, was at this period the ablest and most winning representative of the school of Andrews and Laud. Born in 1792, the son of an Anglican minister,

* *Life and Correspondence of Whately*, London, 1866.
† Coleridge, *Memoir of John Keble*, London, 1869.

he was reared in the principles of the High Church section, and, as a student, and afterwards as a fellow of Oriel, he continued to uphold these principles in spite of the opposition and raillery of Whately and Arnold. But he was of a retiring disposition, better fitted for a life of seclusion than for the position of a leader in a movement, and he retired from the university to the calm of his father's rectory in Gloucestershire. Here he composed *The Christian Year*, which was published in 1827, and contributed much to the spread of High Church views. His place at Oxford was, however, taken by one of his pupils, Richard Hurrell Froude, who, like Keble, was the son of an Anglican clergyman, and was thoroughly imbued with the principles of the High Church party. He was elected fellow of Oriel in 1826, and, unlike his master, being of a combative disposition, he boldly proclaimed his views in their most extreme form, and disputed every inch of ground with his colleagues of the Liberal school.*

Still the real leader in the High Church movement in Oxford was neither Keble nor Froude, but a man who combined in his own person all that was best in both without either the shyness of Keble or the impetuosity of Froude, and this man was John Henry Newman. He was born in 1801, the son of a London banker, entered Trinity College, Oxford, in 1816, and was elected fellow of Oriel College in 1822. At that period Newman might be described as an Evangelical in religion, with at the same time a slight leaning to Calvinism, which in his youth he had imbibed from the instructions of his mother, the descendant of a Huguenot family. From 1822 till 1826 Newman was on terms of intimate friendship with Whately, and it seemed not unlikely that the stern evangelicism of Newman would soon disappear before the criticism and ridicule of the Liberal, Whately. Gradually, however, the relationship between Newman and Whately began to grow less familiar, according as Whately perceived that Newman shared his friend-

* *Froude's Remains*, London, 1838-9.

ship with others of a different school, and finally the Peel election in Oxford put an end to their friendly intercourse.*

Newman had, however, learned from Whately two principles which influenced his future career, namely, the existence of the Church as a visible society, and its independence of state authority. Besides, as fellow of Oriel, he had become friendly with the representatives of the Oxford High Church party. As a student of Dr. Lloyd, the Regius professor of divinity, and a High Churchman of the old school, he was brought into contact with High Church principles, and with the leaders of the High Church party in Oxford, especially with Hurrell Froude and Edward B. Pusey, the latter of whom had been also elected fellow of Oriel in 1823. Under the influence of this school the tendency of Newman towards Liberalism and Latitudinarianism began to disappear, and Whately soon realised that, instead of having gained a disciple, he was face to face with the leader of a new movement.

In 1824 Newman received orders and was named curate of St. Clements, one of the Oxford churches; in the following year he acted under Whately as vice-principal of Alban Hall; and in 1826 the position of tutor in his old college of Oriel was offered to him, and he accepted it. As tutor he was placed in a position of considerable influence, and in the course of a few years he had gathered around him a group of Oxford men who, like himself, were sincerely interested in religious problems. Among these were Hurrell Froude and Robert Wilberforce, both of them former pupils of Keble, and, like Newman, tutors of Oriel (1828). Through these two Newman was brought into close touch with Keble himself. Pusey, too, was in close relationship with this group. Day by day the religious opinions of Newman took a more Catholic tone, though, unlike Froude, he still regarded the Roman Church with the greatest aversion, and was inclined to admire the

* *Apologia*, Chap. I.

work of the Reformers. In 1828, Newman was called upon to accept the important office of vicar of St. Mary's, the church of the university, where his course of sermons soon began to attract the attention of the most intellectual of the Oxford men. By this time he had bid adieu to the Liberalism of Whately, and was already regarded as a leader in the councils of the High Church party.

In 1829, came the Peel election at Oxford. The tide had turned in favour of the Whigs, and men began to fear that with the downfall of the Tory party the position of the Established Church was in serious danger. Sir Robert Peel, the member for Oxford, under the stress of the agitation in Ireland, changed his views on Catholic Emancipation; and when he sought re-election at Oxford his return was bitterly opposed by the High Church party. The Liberal party, led by Whately and his friends, supported Peel, while the opposition grouped itself mainly round Newman, Froude and Keble. It was not exactly that Newman was an enemy to Catholic Emancipation, but he considered that in the circumstances Sir Robert Peel had betrayed the university into the hands of the Whigs,* and that the university should show its disapproval of such conduct, and of the anti-Church policy of the Whig party. Oriel College was almost unanimous in its opposition to Peel, and in the end the minister was defeated by a considerable majority. This election marked a distinct stage in the development of Newman's religious opinions. It put an end to all friendly intercourse with Whately, and committed Newman definitely to the High Church Oxford group.

The Reform movement that swept over England at the same period was viewed with considerable alarm by earnest churchmen. It was feared that political and social reforms might involve considerable changes in the Anglican Church, and the tone of the Whig speeches was not calculated to re-assure men's minds. It was proclaimed that if the Anglican Church was still to

* *Apologia*, p. 14.

remain the state church she must be prepared to accept important reforms, and to adopt a more liberal attitude towards the Dissenters. Such threats had no terror for Liberals of the school of Arnold, who were prepared to compromise on doctrines of secondary importance so long as the great dogmas like the Trinity and Incarnation were secured, but they served to rouse the whole fighting strength of the High Church party. These men were determined to introduce new life into the Anglican Church by an appeal to antiquity, and by bringing it into closer line with the Church of the earlier centuries. Mr. Rose of Cambridge undertook the publication of a library of theological works, and he asked Newman to write for this series a sketch of the Arians of the Fourth Century. Such a work was entirely after Newman's taste, especially as he had already begun to study the works of the early Fathers, and of the great Anglican divines of the seventeenth century.* This work was finished by him in 1832.

In the same year Newman accompanied Froude, who had been ordered to the Continent by his medical advisers. In the course of their tour they visited Rome, and had interviews with Dr. Wiseman, then rector of the English College, from whom they received a warm welcome.† In Rome, Newman seems to have been divided between his feelings of loyalty to his own church, and his admiration for a system which so closely resembled the Catholic Church of the early centuries. He felt drawn to Rome because he saw that it represented a great, united, independent, spiritual organisation that recalled to his mind the Christian organisation that had repelled the Arian aggression; but, on the other hand, he was repelled by what he considered its stern and unbending attitude towards the other religious bodies. In April, 1833, they left Rome, Newman going south to Naples and Sicily, and Froude to Germany. In Sicily Newman fell seriously ill, and, believing himself to be

* *Apologia*, p. 25.
† *Life of Wiseman*, Chap. I., pp. 117-9.

in danger of death, he set himself to examine more carefully his religious and doctrinal position. The result of that examination may be seen in the poem, *Lead Kindly Light,* which he composed on board the vessel that brought him back to England.*

He arrived in England at a time when all Oxford was agitated by the measure introduced by the Whigs for the suppression of a number of the Irish bishoprics. The Whigs had been forced to this step by the threatening aspect of the tithe agitation in Ireland, but High Churchmen, regardless of the ministerial difficulties, denounced the measure as an unwarrantable interference of the state in matters ecclesiastical, and as the harbinger of a combined attack upon the privileges of the Established Church not alone in Ireland but also in England. Five days after Newman's arrival in England (14th July, 1833) Keble preached before the university of Oxford his famous sermon on *National Apostasy*. He denounced the bill before Parliament as being in opposition to the whole religious history of England, and he called upon all loyal Churchmen to lend their assistance to the Anglican Church in its moment of peril. The sermon produced a profound impression in England, and it is regarded by Newman in his *Apologia* as the beginning of the Oxford movement.†

To give practical effect to this appeal consultations were held between Newman, Keble, Froude, Professor Rose of Cambridge, Professor Palmer, and Arthur Perceval. The three latter were anxious to found an association with a central committee, which should control the writings of the individual members, but Newman and his friends rejected this scheme, as calculated to repress the daring enthusiasm which is so valuable an asset in such movements. While the negotiations were going on Newman took a decisive step by publishing the first of the series known as *Tracts for the Times*. It was published on the 9th September,

* *Apologia*, pp. 32-35.
† *Idem.*, p. 35.

1833, without any name, and consisted of only three pages, entitled *Thoughts on the Divine Commission,* addressed principally to clergymen.

The Tracts were published at irregular intervals, and were recognised as the work of the Oxford men. Their aim was to bring home to the clergy the idea of the Catholic Church, its unity, and its independence of state control, the apostolic succession of the bishops and their jurisdiction derived directly from Christ through the Apostles and the successors of the Apostles, the sacramental system, the liturgy, the advantages of fasting, prayers, mortification, frequent communion, &c. They followed no logical sequence, nor did the writers intend to put forward a complete system of theological teaching, but they strove to recall the doctrines of the great High Church writers of the seventeenth century, and to destroy the distinctly Protestant element in the Anglican Church by bringing forward prominently the teaching of the Catholic Church in the early centuries. They attacked the position of the Liberal party by insisting upon the importance of dogmatic beliefs and by fixing attention on the ideas of a visible Church, with apostolic succession, and a sacramental system. But though they were strongly Catholic in tone they were often bigoted in their references to the Roman Church, and to its supposed corruptions and novelties.

In the beginning most of the Tracts were written by Newman himself, as Froude was too ill to contribute much, and Pusey, Palmer, Rose and Perceval were unwilling to accept responsibility for such a work. It was here that Newman first displayed his wonderful command over the English language, and his capacity for adapting his style to the needs of his readers. They were full of fire and passion, composed in the jerky nervous style of an appeal to arms, and bearing the stamp of the writer's enthusiasm and conviction in every line. At first it was difficult to secure a proper circulation for them owing to their anonymous character and

the unwillingness of publishers to push the sales of pamphlets sold at such a small price as two pence. But bands of volunteers undertook to deliver them through England, and in a short time, as they became better known, and as the ideas put forward in the earlier ones began to make an impression on the Anglican clergy, the demand for them became enormous. The great body of the lower clergy were considerably stirred by the Tracts, and many of them made no secret of their sympathy with the writers who insisted so energetically on the doctrines of the independence of the Church, apostolic succession, and the efficacy of the sacraments; but, on the other hand, the bishops were alarmed at the temerity of such views, and feared that they would end by calling forth new aggressions on the part of the state. An address was presented by a large body of the clergy to the archbishop of Canterbury, declaring their attachment to the Church, and their determination to defend its rights and privileges; and this was followed by a similar address signed by a large body of laymen.

Pusey followed the publication of the Tracts with considerable interest, but for a long time he was unwilling to give the movement his active co-operation. Whatever little he did (Tract 18, Fasting) was printed over his own initials, so as to avoid responsibility for the writings of others; but in 1834, when Froude was too ill to work, and when Newman himself was exhausted by his labours, Pusey began to take an active part in the movement, and in 1835 appeared his three Tracts on Baptism. The adhesion of Pusey changed the character of the Tracts. He thought that the earlier pamphlets having served their purpose, more attention should be paid to the production of solid scientific treatises. His own tracts served as a model to be imitated by the other writers. Pusey also established a theological society, in order to awaken an interest in such subjects, and with the collaboration of Newman and Keble he undertook the publication of an English translation of the works of the Fathers who wrote before the division between the

Western and Eastern Churches.* But if Newman and Keble had cause for rejoicing in the accession of Pusey, they had soon to bewail the loss of their friend to whom Newman, at least, was indebted for many of his Catholic views, namely, Hurrell Froude. The latter was in many senses the most human and the most lovable character in the whole movement, and had not death cut short his career there can be little doubt that he would have declared for Rome. He was never tired of denouncing the detestable Protestantism of the Reformers and of praising the beauties of the Roman Church. In this respect he was far ahead of Newman, who at this period regarded the Roman Church with manifest distrust, and who was still persuaded that the proper course for the Anglican Church lay midway between the Protestantism of the Reformers and the novelties of Rome.† By avoiding these two extremes she might get into touch, he thought, with the Catholic Church of the early centuries.

In 1836, the *Regius* professorship of divinity became vacant, and the government determined to appoint Dr. Hampden. The announcement of such a selection roused a regular storm of opposition in Oxford. Dr. Hampden was rightly suspected of latitudinarianism in doctrine, and it was feared that he would use his position in Oxford to spread his own liberal ideas among the undergraduates. The Tractarians offered an unbending opposition to his appointment, and were strongly supported by the Evangelical party, while the Liberals following the lead of Dr. Arnold entered the lists in favour of the government's candidate. Needless to say, Dr. Hampden was duly installed, but Newman and his friends brought the matter before convocation, and secured a large majority for the proposed vote of censure.‡ During this bitter controversy Dr. Arnold and his friends warmly assailed the Tractarian party for their "Romanising" tendencies and their disloyalty to their own Church. Such an accusation was regarded by

* *Library of the Fathers*, 1838-1885.
† *Tracts*, 38-41.
‡ Morley, *Life of Gladstone*, Vol. I., p. 167.

them as an injurious calumny, but at the same time it forced them to explain more clearly their attitude towards the Roman Church. Newman himself undertook to furnish an exact statement of their position on this question in Tract 71, and in an article entitled *Home Thoughts Abroad,* in the *British Magazine.** He rejected as untenable the common-place Protestant arguments against the Roman Church on the score that, if they were of any value they should tell with equal force against the doctrine of a visible Church. He admitted that in some respects the Roman Church was far superior to the Anglican, especially in its Catholicity, and he argued against it solely on the ground that by introducing novel doctrines, such, for instance, as had been defined by the Council of Trent, she had broken her connection with the Church of the early Fathers, and had forfeited, therefore, the note of Apostolicity. But as regards this he pointed out that the Anglican Church was equally separated from the Catholic Church by the Protestant corruption which had been introduced in the stormy days of the Reformation, and, as a consequence, the only safe course was the *Via Media* between Rome and Protestantism.

Meanwhile, what was the position of the English Catholics during these years immediately following Catholic Emancipation? In the lull that followed after the stormy years of agitation the Catholics of England had dropped out of public notice. The Emancipation Act had broken their chains, and had made them freemen, but it was not so easy to eradicate the feelings and habits induced by centuries of persecution. All their great leaders were gone, and it seemed at first sight as if nobody were left to take the place of Challoner or Milner. This would have been all the more regrettable in the peculiar circumstances of the period, when a large and most influential body of English Protestants were endeavouring to re-cast the attitude of their co-religionists towards the Catholic Church, and when able Catholic

* March-April, 1836.

writers could do so much by setting forth the doctrines of their creed in an attractive form. Fortunately, a special Providence seems to have been watching over Catholic interests in England at the time, and a man, greater than Challoner or Milner appeared upon the scene to defend the Catholic position, namely, Dr. Nicholas Wiseman.

Nicholas Wiseman was the son of James Wiseman, an Irish merchant of Seville, by his second wife, Miss Xaviera Strange of Kilkenny. He was born in Seville on 2nd August, 1802. On the death of her husband, in 1805, Mrs. Wiseman removed with her family to Ireland, and the future cardinal was sent to a boarding school at Waterford, where he remained two years. From Waterford he passed to Ushaw, in 1810, where he attracted the friendly notice of Dr. Lingard, then the vice-president of the college, and of Dr. Newsham, afterwards president of Ushaw. Here he determined to become a priest, and on the re-opening of the English College in Rome in 1818, young Wiseman and five companions were sent there from Ushaw to pursue their studies. It was in Rome that Wiseman first showed signs of the remarkable abilities that were afterwards to make his name famous in Europe. In 1824 he underwent the examination for his doctorate in divinity with great success, and in the following year he was ordained priest.

After his ordination he remained in Rome, devoting himself to an examination of the antiquities of the city and the study of the Syriac manuscripts in the Vatican Library under the guidance of the celebrated linguist, Cardinal Mai. In 1827, when Dr. Wiseman was only twenty-four, he published the *Horae Syriacae,* which sufficed to gain him a reputation amongst the Syriac scholars of Europe, by whom he was frequently consulted on difficult points of philology. He also published a work on the text of the "Three Witnesses," which was of considerable value on account of its dissertation on the antiquity and origin of the *Vetus Itala.* In 1828, Wiseman was appointed rector of the English college, a position which he held till 1840.

As rector of the English college he was brought into contact with many of the distinguished visitors to Rome. Lamennais and his colleagues visited him sometimes during their stay in Rome and helped to bring home to his mind the extent of the great Catholic revival that was then passing over Europe. Ignatius Spencer, the brother of Lord Spencer, came as a student to the English College at Rome, and was ordained there in 1830. Recognising the extraordinary abilities of the young rector, and fully conscious of the opportunities that awaited Catholicism in England, he urged him to put aside his manuscripts and his antiquities, and devote his energies to the conversion of his own countrymen. Thoughts of a similar kind, inspired, no doubt, by the wonderful success of his sermons to English congregations in Rome, had already crossed Wiseman's mind, and after the visit of Newman and Hurrell Froude in 1833, and their account of the feelings of themselves and their co-religionists, he made up his mind that England was destined to be the sphere of his activity.

Meanwhile, he delivered his remarkable series of lectures *On the Connection between Science and Revealed Religion*. They represented the results of his philological and scientific research, and were regarded as of the highest importance even by those who disregarded the lecturer's system of apologetics. He received the congratulations of distinguished scholars, Catholic and non-Catholic, in England, France and Germany, and, at this period of his life, when he was about to bid good-bye to his scientific studies in order to throw himself into the work of converting England, Wiseman, though only thirty-three, was regarded as one of the leading scholars of Europe.

He was, therefore, a fit man to defend the Catholic interests in England, at a time when the claims of Catholicity were dividing the scholars of Oxford. He returned to England in 1835, and undertook to preach in the Sardinian Chapel in London, first for the Italian congregation, and afterwards a course of lectures

addressed to both Catholics and Protestants. The fame of these lectures quickly spread, and Dr. Wiseman was invited to give a similar series in Moorfields Church in Lent, 1836, when the church was thronged by the leading men of London. The lectures were not controversial, but were devoted rather to an explanation of the Catholic system. Newman referred to these sermons in an article in the *British Critic*, 1836, pointing out that they were totally destructive of the distinctly Protestant principles of certain English churchmen, and that they would have the effect of drawing such men into the Roman Church, and of awakening the Catholic movement in the Established Church of England.* The lectures, when published, received a generous welcome in nearly all the papers and reviews; the ability and the success of Wiseman were recognised on all sides; and the Catholics became conscious that in the person of Wiseman they had a champion who could compare favourably with the very ablest of their opponents.

Dr. Wiseman felt the want of a suitable magazine in which he could ventilate his views on the burning questions of the hour, and keep in touch with the Tractarian movement. The *Catholic Magazine* † was still in existence, but it was distinctly Cisalpine in its tone, and Wiseman would have no connection with such an organ. Just then O'Connell approached him on the very subject which was uppermost in his own mind, and between them they agreed to found the *Dublin Review* (1836). The new review was to be distinctly Catholic in its tone and to give it an international character, Wiseman secured the co-operation of many distinguished Catholic scholars in France and Germany. The first number of the *Dublin Review* appeared in May, 1836, and fully reached the high standard that Wiseman had laid down. He returned to his post in Rome towards the end of the year, but his heart was now in England and his mind filled with schemes for the conversion of the nation.

* *Life of Wiseman*, Vol. I., pp. 241-44.
† *Idem.*, pp. 249-51.

In Rome he received visits from Macaulay and from Gladstone (1838), the latter of whom was particularly captivated by his winning manner, and the absence in his demeanour "of the characteristics of the proselytiser." * He was in communication with the Liberal Catholics of France and Germany, with the old Catholic representatives in England, with O'Connell and his Irish supporters, and with Protestants of all shades of opinion. Owing to his antecedents and position he was exactly fitted for the difficult task of bringing so many different and conflicting elements together, and especially for securing co-operation for religious purposes between the English and Irish Catholics, and for dispelling the prejudices of the Oxford men against O'Connell as being the ally of the Whigs and the enemy of the Established Church.

Meanwhile, Newman felt it necessary, in view of the attitude of the *Dublin Review*, to re-cast his plan of a *Via Media* between the Roman and Protestant corruptions in a work entitled *The Prophetical Office of the Church*, &c. (1837),† but it was clear that he was at a loss for a sound theological justification of the English separation from Rome. The tone of the Tracts was distinctly favourable to Catholicity, while the publication by Newman and Keble in 1838 of the first volume of the *Remains* of Hurrell Froude, containing as they did a strong apology for Rome, and an equally strong condemnation of the Reformers and Protestantism, was sufficient to create a panic in Protestant circles. To counteract the effects of such a work a subscription was opened to erect a monument to Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer, which was supported by the Anglican bishops, some of whom began to warn their clergy against the Tracts (1838-1839).

But the charges of the bishops had little effect on the movement. New editions of the Tracts and of Newman's sermons at St. Mary's were quickly exhausted,

* *Life of Wiseman*, Vol. I., p. 277.
† *Apologia*, pp. 64-72.

and new disciples were being won over to the party. The most remarkable of these were Church, Faber, Dalgairns, Hope Scott, Manning (who left Oxford in 1832), Stanley and William George Ward. The latter had come to Oxford, an ardent disciple of Arnold, and it was with great difficulty he could be induced to hear a sermon from Newman, but in a short time he abandoned his youthful Liberalism and definitely joined the camp of Newman and Pusey. Newman's theory of the *Via Media* satisfied himself, and convinced his followers that their only duty was to Catholicise the English Church.*

Newman, however, soon received a shock that weakened his faith in the *Via Media*. In 1839 he resumed his study of the Fathers and set himself to examine the Eutychian controversy, and in the course of his reading it suddenly dawned upon him that the Eutychians in their day stood in the same relation to the Catholic Church as did the Anglican Church of his time to Rome, and that every argument which he could adduce to justify the Anglican schism might be urged with equal force in favour of the Eutychians.† While his mind was troubled with this doubt his attention was directed to an article in the *Dublin Review* from the pen of Dr. Wiseman on St. Augustine and the Donatists. St. Augustine, in his arguments with the Donatists, laid it down as a sufficiently evident doctrine that in matters of heresy and schism there ought to be some simple principle for the guidance of individuals and local churches, and that this principle was the opinion of the churches throughout the world. If the great body of the Church was unanimous in refusing to communicate with an individual or a local church, then the individual or this church was clearly in error. St. Augustine summed up his position in the famous sentence, *Quapropter securus judicat orbis terrarum, bonos non esse qui se dividunt ab orbe terrarum, in quacumque parte orbis terrarum.* Dr. Wiseman showed in his article that the position of the

* *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement*, Vol. I., pp. 78-99.
† *Apologia*, pp. 115-18.

Donatists resembled in every particular the position of the Anglicans, and that every argument then adduced by Newman and his party to strengthen the Anglican position had been already advanced by the Donatists, and condemned by St. Augustine and the Catholic Church. Finally, the great churchmen of those days, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, John the Patriarch of Constantinople, and Hormisdas had given another simple test by which it might be decided whether a local church was in communion with the Catholic Church or in schism, namely, was it or was it not in communion with the See of Peter? *

Wiseman's article (July, 1839) put the discussion upon a new level, and, as Newman confessed to his intimate friends, it dealt a terrible blow to his whole theological system. But unless he were to give up the contest in despair he was obliged to publish a reply to such a crushing indictment. In his reply, Newman admitted that the Anglican Church had lost the notes of unity and Catholicity, that, in fact, it was in schism, but he endeavoured to prove that schism in the circumstances was justifiable on account of the corruptions of Rome. This sounded dangerously like the Protestantism which Newman himself had rejected as untenable; and as he himself admitted, at this period he tried to justify himself rather by his contempt for O'Connell and for his alliance with Liberalism, than by any sound scientific argument. From this time forward his conscience would not permit Newman to say or write hard things of the Roman Church.

It was at this critical stage of the movement that Wiseman was called upon to take up the responsible position of coadjutor to the vicar apostolic of the Central district, and president of Oscott College. He was consecrated by Cardinal Fransoni on 8th June, 1840, in the chapel of the English College at Rome, and took up residence at Oscott in September of the same year. He determined to make Oscott the centre for encouraging

* *Life of Wiseman*, pp. 320-31.

the Catholic tendencies of the Oxford movement, and for drawing the advanced party towards a union with Rome. Though the professors in Oscott viewed such a project with little enthusiasm, Dr. Wiseman was strongly supported by converts like Father Ignatius Spencer, the great architect, Pugin, and Mr. Lisle Phillipps, and through these communications were opened up with Newman's followers, more especially with Oakeley and Ward.*

Newman was in a state of great mental trouble, unable to satisfy himself, and unwilling to deceive his followers. Many of the latter, especially Ward, were going rapidly towards Rome, and felt it difficult to reconcile their acceptance of the Thirty-nine Articles with their belief in the Catholic principles, like the Apostolic Succession, the Sacraments, the Mass, the Real Presence, &c. Newman felt that unless the official creed of the Anglican Church could be explained in a Catholic sense her position was incapable of defence, and his supporters would certainly go over to Rome. It was, therefore, to explain how the Thirty-nine Articles could be subscribed to by a person who rejected the Protestant corruptions in favour of Catholic principles that Newman wrote Tract 90, the last of the series.† He distinguished between, first, Catholic belief of the early centuries, second, the Roman dogmas of Trent, and third, certain beliefs in the Roman Church which were not dogmas, but rather dominant errors. He undertook to show that the Thirty-nine Articles did not condemn the Catholic principles of the early ages, nor were they opposed to any of the dogmas of the Roman Church. They condemned merely certain popular errors or exaggerations which had not the force of dogmatic beliefs. In the course of the Tract he proceeded to apply these principles to the teaching of the Articles on the Church, Scripture, General Councils, Justification, Purgatory, the Mass and Celibacy, and he undertook to show how, by the providence of God,

* *Life of Wiseman*, Chap. XI.
† *William George Ward*, Vol. I., pp. 150-1. *Apologia*, p. 129.

though the Articles were drawn up in an intensely anti-Catholic age, they were framed in such an ambiguous way that they condemned no Catholic doctrine, and might be subscribed to by a man who accepted the decrees of Trent.

The Tract was published in February, 1841, and, as Newman himself expected, it provoked a storm of opposition in the university and throughout the country. Four of the prominent tutors, amongst them being Tait, the future archbishop of Canterbury, addressed a protest to the editors of the Tracts; the Board of Oxford condemned the Tract as advocating an interpretation of the Articles incompatible with the statutes of the university; and the writer was denounced in the House of Lords as a betrayer of the Anglican Church.* The bishop of Oxford was in a difficult position, and, after consulting the archbishop of Canterbury, he requested Newman to suppress the Tract. The latter replied that he was quite ready to comply if the suppression were directed by the bishop, but that in such an event he must resign his position as vicar of St. Mary's. The bishop, fearing the result of such an extreme course, agreed to a compromise, namely, that Newman should not be obliged to suppress the Tract, but that the further publication of the Tracts should be suspended.†

In face of the attacks of the Liberal school, especially of Arnold and the writers of the *Edinburgh Review*, Newman remained silent, but not so, however, his friends, Keble, Pusey, Palmer and Ward, who defended the incriminated Tract, and repelled the charge of dishonesty. The feeling in Oxford became very intense, and the authorities made no secret of their hostility to the Tractarian party. Arnold was brought up from Rugby and appointed *Regius* professor of history in order that he might counteract the influence of Newman and his friends among the undergraduates.‡ He was a man in

* *William George Ward*, Chap. VIII.
† *Apologia*, pp. 136-39.
‡ Thureau-Dangin, Vol. I., p. 229.

every way suited for such a difficult task, and had he been spared he might have proved a dangerous rival, but he took ill and died in the following year, 1842.

So long as the bishops did not repudiate the Catholic claims of the Anglican Church Newman felt tolerably secure, but in their pastorals (1841-1842) many of them denounced the interpretation put upon the Articles by the Tractarians, and some of them even went so far as to declare that they would never ordain any candidate holding such opinions. While the bishops were thus rejecting all claims to Catholicity they showed their eagerness to fraternise with the Lutheran Churches of Germany in the erection of a Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem (1841). The new bishopric was to be filled alternately by England and Prussia, and the bishop was to rule over the whole Protestant community, whether they were Anglican, Lutheran, or Calvinist. Arnold was rejoiced at such a step, because it indicated that the National Church had woke up to the fact that it was broad enough to receive all Christians; while to Newman the negotiations for the establishment of a bishopric in such circumstances came as a complete shock. They showed that the Anglican Church was willing to ally itself with all classes of Dissenters, even to the abandonment of Apostolic Succession, provided she could strike a blow at Rome, and indicated clearly enough the Protestantism of the Established Church.*

The attitude of Dr. Wiseman during this crisis was strongly sympathetic. He discouraged all bitter attacks upon the Tractarian party, and sought to impress upon his friends to adopt a friendly tone whenever it was necessary to engage in controversy. Though the Catholic body of England rather disapproved of his attitude, not so, however, Rome, whence he received from Gregory XVI. himself a letter full of approval and encouragement. He continued to assist in turning the movement towards Rome, not alone by his public articles but by his private correspondence with the party. It was in the same year

* *Apologia*, p. 141-46.

(1841) that Dr. Russell of Maynooth began the correspondence with Newman, which was destined to have such an influence on his conversion. While the Oxford men were being persecuted by their own co-religionists, Wiseman and his friends were giving them unmistakable signs of friendly attention, which made a deep impression upon Newman and his friends.*

Meanwhile, it soon became evident that there was something of a split between the extreme section of the Tractarians represented by Ward and Oakeley and the moderate section led by Pusey. Ward was strong in asserting the superiority of the Roman over the Anglican Church, and the necessity of effecting a union with Rome. Pusey objected to such statements as disloyal, and appealed to Newman for support. But Newman, though not agreeing with everything put forward by Ward, was unwilling publicly to condemn him, especially as he himself was without any solid basis for his theological views.† Towards the end of 1842 Newman decided to hand over St. Mary's to the charge of a curate, and to retire to Littlemore, an outlying hamlet in the parish. There he had previously built a church, to which he resolved to retire for prayer and study. Many of his young associates joined him in this place of retirement, and the little community followed a monastic course of life, with meditation, study, frequent communion, fasts, abstinence and the recitation of the breviary.

Ward and his friends were impatient, and continued to denounce the untenable position of the Anglican Church, and to insist upon the necessity of submission to Rome. Even Pusey was startled by such language, but Newman refused to join in his remonstrances. But, moderate as Pusey believed himself to be, he did not escape censure from the Protestant party in the university, and a sermon of his on the Eucharist and Absolution, delivered in May, 1843, having been

* *Life of Wiseman*, Chap. XII.
† *William George Ward*, Chaps. VIII., IX.

brought under the notice of the authorities, he was prohibited from preaching within the precincts of the university for a period of two years. In the quiet atmosphere of Littlemore, Newman had an opportunity of reconsidering his whole position, and he decided that as all his arguments against Rome were worthless, and as he had no longer any confidence in the position of the Anglican Church, he was in duty bound to resign his pastoral charge. On the 24th September, 1843, before a crowded audience, he preached his farewell sermon, entitled *The Parting of Friends,* and with a heavy heart he bade adieu to St. Mary's.

The resignation caused great emotion in Anglican circles. Though Newman had not announced his secession, yet it was felt that Rome was now his ultimate goal, and even Pusey abandoned all hope of securing Newman's support in his struggle with the extremists of their party. Ward, shut out from the reviews, undertook the preparation of a work entitled *The Ideal of a Christian Church, &c.,* which was published in June, 1844. In this work he renewed his attacks on the Reformers and upon the Protestant corruptions of the Church, and he issued a challenge to the university authorities by announcing that when he signed the Thirty-nine Articles three years before on securing his fellowship he declared that he rejected no dogma of the Roman Church, and yet he had been allowed to retain his fellowship without molestation. The moderate men of the Tractarians were grieved at the tone of the work, but the younger and more impetuous section were enthusiastic in their applause.

At the opening of the university in October the heads of the colleges met to discuss Ward's book, and they announced that they would propose in the approaching convocation, first, that the book be condemned, second, that the author be deprived of his university degrees, and third, that those subscribing to the Articles in future must declare that they signed them in the sense originally intended.* The announcement of such an

* *William George Ward*, Vol. I., pp. 308-9, Appendix H.

extreme penalty against Ward secured for him the sympathy of those who would have voted readily for the condemnation of his book, while the third resolution, regarding the new test of orthodoxy, was received with such general disapproval that it was withdrawn, and the condemnation of Tract 90 substituted

The Convocation met on 13th February, 1845, and the importance of the meeting was evident from the unusual concourse in attendance. The excitement both inside and outside the hall was intense. Ward was present, and defended himself in a speech of remarkable vigour and brilliancy, but the vote of censure upon his book was carried by 777 votes against 391. When, however, the question of depriving him of his university degrees was put to the meeting it was evident that there was a sharp division of opinion as to the justice of such a punishment, but it, too, was carried by 569 against 511. The motion for the condemnation of Tract 90 led to a scene of great commotion, but one of the proctors intervened and stopped the discussion by vetoing the measure.*

Oakeley was the friend of Ward, and he stood by him in the crisis. He wrote to the vice-chancellor from his London chaplaincy that he shared the views put forward by Ward, and he announced to his bishop that he accepted all the Roman doctrines. The ceremonies in his church had already given the bishop some reason for complaint, and Oakeley was summoned before the Court of Arches in June, 1845, and condemned to perpetual suspension from his office. The bishops, the university and the law courts were, therefore, unanimous in declaring that there was no room in the Anglican Church for the Tractarian party, and that they should seek elsewhere a religious haven.

Newman had by this time lost all interest in such discussions, and took no part in the Convocation struggle. The only obstacle preventing him from going over to Rome was what he deemed "the novelties," which had

* *William George Ward*, Vol. I., pp. 337-45.

been introduced since the fifth or sixth century. He set himself to an earnest investigation of these doctrines with the view of determining whether they were really novel corruptions or only a legitimate development of the Apostolic doctrines. In this study the theory of development put forward by St. Vincent of Lerins attracted his attention, and he soon began to realise that the very life of a religion demands an evolution of its doctrine, not in the sense that its dogmas must change their meaning, but that they must be drawn out and explained so as to suit new circumstances and new forms of error. He realised that the deposit of faith must have been large enough to draw from till the end of time, and that in religion, as in everything else, stagnation was as dangerous as development. But he realised, too, that there must be means of distinguishing between legitimate deductions and the rash conclusions of individuals, and that this means was given by Christ in the establishment of an Infallible Church. He began this study in 1843, and as he proceeded his doubts gradually disappeared, and by the beginning of 1845, when the *Essay on Development* was practically finished, he had made up his mind to join the Catholic Church.

In August, 1845, it was rumoured that Ward was about to make his submission to Rome, and he did so in September. Dalgairns was received in the same month, as was Ambrose St. John, the special friend of Newman. Early in October Stanton announced his intention of being received at Stonyhurst, and Newman wrote to him to come to Littlemore, where he himself was going to be received by Father Dominic, the Passionist. Father Dominic arrived at Littlemore on 8th October, 1845, heard the confessions of Newman, Bowles and Stanton, gave them conditional baptism, and at his mass (10th Oct.) administered to them the Holy Communion. The long struggle was at last over, and Newman felt at peace in the bosom of the Catholic Church. His conversion made a great sensation in England. Everyone felt that it was an event in the

history of the Anglican Church, the consequences of which it was difficult to forecast. Every month, almost every week, brought word of new secessions from Anglicanism, especially from the ranks of the clergy and of the university men. But the moderate Tractarians, Pusey and Keble, remained at their post, and set themselves to build up the breaches that had been made by their friends. They did not blame Newman or the others who had gone out from their camp, but the old bonds of intimate friendship were severed, and, henceforth, their relations were to be colder and more reserved.

Though some of the Catholic body did not rejoice at the conversion of the Oxford men, and were inclined to regard with distrust the influence of the new recruits on the future of the Catholic Church in England, Dr. Wiseman shared no such prejudices, and spared no pains to give them a warm welcome, just as he had spared none to secure their conversion. Newman and a few of his friends visited Wiseman at Oscott in November, 1845, and received from him the Sacrament of Confirmation. Under the charm of Wiseman's kindness and attention the misgivings which they had hitherto entertained about the Catholic clergy gradually disappeared. The community removed from Littlemore to the old College at Oscott, where they continued the usual course of life. Newman published the *Essay on Development* (1845), which had led to his own conversion, and which was awaited with anxiety by Anglicans of all shades of opinion. The line of argument was so far different from that of similar works, that though Gladstone urged the theologians of his Church to undertake a reply, nobody could be found to engage in the difficult task. Manning did, indeed, begin the preparation of a reply, but he soon abandoned the attempt. The future of the converts was a question that had to be met by themselves and by Dr. Wiseman. Many of them, amongst whom was Newman, were unmarried, and were anxious to become priests in the

Catholic Church. Dr. Wiseman was anxious that Newman should study in Rome, and in the autumn of 1846, accompanied by his dear friend, Ambrose St. John, he set out for Rome, where he arrived in October, and took up his residence in the Propaganda College. He was ordained priest in 1847, and as Dr. Wiseman was anxious that he should introduce the Oratorians of St. Philip Neri, he took up his residence in the Oratory at Rome. He returned to England in 1847, and founded the Oratory at Birmingham. Here he was soon joined by Faber and his friends, and before the end of 1848 about eighty members, most of them converts, had joined the new community. Ward, who was married, took up his residence near Old Hall.

(*c*) The Church in England from the Establishment of the Hierarchy

Ward, *Life of Wiseman.* Purcell, *Life of Manning*, 2 vols., London, 1895. Hutton, *Life of Cardinal Newman*, London, 1891. Ward, *William George Ward and the Catholic Revival*, London, 1893. Gasquet, *Lord Acton and His Circle*, London, 1907. Thureau-Dangin, *La Renaissance Catholique en Angleterre au XIX^e^ Siècle*, 3 vols., Paris, 1899-1903, Vols. II., III.

For years the English Catholics had been governed by four vicars apostolic, and in 1840 the number was increased to eight, but as the Catholic population increased, owing principally to the immigration from Ireland and the conversions from Anglicanism, it was felt by many that the time had come when a regular hierarchy should be re-established in England. Petitions to that effect were sent to Pius IX. in 1847, but on account of the Revolution at Rome, and the flight of the Pope to Gaëta, the project was dropped for a while, only to be taken up anew in 1850, Dr. Wiseman, who had succeeded Dr. Walsh in 1849 as vicar of the London district, was notified from Rome (1850) that the Pope intended to re-establish the hierarchy, and at the same time to appoint him a cardinal. Wiseman was dis-

consolate at the idea of taking up his residence in Rome, but his friends petitioned the Holy See against depriving England of the services of such a man at a critical period in the history of English Catholicism. Pius IX. acceded to their request, and determined to appoint Dr. Wiseman archbishop of Westminster, metropolitan of England, and cardinal. On the 29th September, Pius IX. published the brief re-establishing the hierarchy in England, twelve bishops with a metropolitan, and in a public consistory on the 30th September Dr. Wiseman was created a cardinal. A few days later (7th Oct.) he announced both events to English Catholics in the celebrated pastoral "From out the Flaminian Gate." He left Rome, and started on a tour through Italy, Austria and Germany.

Apparently he had no anticipation of the storm which the publication of the Papal brief was about to create in England. As soon as the news of the re-establishment of the hierarchy and the division of England into dioceses was published, it was assumed that the Pope meant to set aside the Anglican bishops and the Established Church, and that by parcelling out England among his nominees he was guilty of a gross act of aggression against the jurisdiction of the Crown, and the national independence of England. The *Times* opened the onslaught by a stirring article (14th Oct.), in which the Papal brief was denounced as the greatest act of folly yet committed by Rome, and the excitement was not lessened by the appearance of Cardinal Wiseman's pastoral. The Prime Minister, Lord John Russell, instead of striving to allay the storm of bigotry by explaining the real object of the Papal document, helped to rouse the no-Popery element by his famous letter to the bishop of Durham, in which the re-establishment of the hierarchy was denounced as an attempt at imposing a foreign yoke upon England with the help of her own renegade sons, but an attempt which the government and the nation would resist with all its strength.

Such a letter coming from the Prime Minister was sufficient to stir up all the anti-Catholic prejudices of England. The Protestant bishops addressed a letter of protest to the queen. Similar protests were passed by the universities and by monster meetings held over England. The feeling against Catholics was intensely bitter, and many people believed that Cardinal Wiseman should be warned to remain on the Continent till the storm should have passed. Wiseman learned the facts of the case on his arrival at Bruges, and he determined immediately to cross to London, where he arrived on 11th November. He set himself to compose an *Appeal to the English People,* which was published in all the newspapers, and which had a good effect in calming the excitement. It contained a true explanation of the Papal brief, pointing out that the re-establishment of the hierarchy did not affect the Established Church, its titles, or its revenue, that it regarded only the English Catholics, and that if the Emancipation were not a sham the Catholics should be allowed to have the religious organisation which they deemed best. The appeal was wonderfully successful, and public men began to be ashamed of such an exhibition of intolerance. The Tories condemned Lord John Russell for having stirred up religious intolerance; but the Prime Minister had already pledged himself to introduce legislation, and he could not draw back. The Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, imposing a fine of £100 on bishops assuming titles to pretended sees in the United Kingdom, invalidating all deeds executed by them, and forfeiting their endowments, was brought in and passed in an amended form, but the clauses were never enforced, and twenty years later the Act was repealed by Gladstone without a word of protest.

The storm against the establishment of the hierarchy had one good effect in bringing nearer to the Church another great convert, hardly less prominent among his co-religionists that Newman had been, namely, Henry Edward Manning. Manning was born in London in

1807, studied at Harrow and at Balliol College, Oxford, received orders in 1832, and was appointed curate, and later rector of Lavington. At first Evangelical in his tendencies, he began to take an interest in the Tractarian movement, and, though never one of the party, like his intimate friend, Gladstone, he sympathised with many of their demands. He did not approve of Tract 90, nor with the attacks made by Ward upon the Reformers, and he undertook to prepare an answer to Newman's *Essay on Development,* but soon realised that his strength did not lie in speculative theology. He became the friend of Pusey, and entered warmly into Pusey's plans for revivifying the Anglican Church. Like Pusey, he was a strong advocate of the efficacy of confession, and he himself attests the fact that the hearing of confessions was one of the chief agents in his conversion.* The party was still strong on the theory that a return to Catholic practices by no means involved submission to Rome.

But the Anglican Church had already rejected all claims to Catholicity by its action with regard to the establishment of the bishopric at Jerusalem, and by the consecration of the Lutheran pastor, Gobat, to that office although he was strongly suspected of Nestorianism. A new proof of the attitude of the Anglican Church was given in 1847, when it was announced that Lord John Russell was about to appoint Dr. Hampden to the bishopric of Hereford. Convocation had already condemned his appointment as *Regius* professor of divinity in Oxford, and had renewed its condemnation in 1842, but in spite of his latitudinarian views Lord John Russell was determined to give him a seat on the bench of bishops in order to neutralise the influence of the High Church party. The High Church party and the Evangelicals were at one in objecting to Dr. Hampden; thirteen of the bishops addressed a joint remonstrance to the Prime Minister; and those bishops who did not sign wrote privately to Lord John Russell

* Purcell, Vol. I., p. 334.

expressing their approval of the document. The Prime Minister, however, persisted in the nomination, and when some members of the Hereford chapter who objected to vote as required, appeared to urge their objections against Dr. Hampden they were refused a hearing. They carried their case to the Queen's Bench, but it decided that the election was valid, and when the question was raised by the bishop of Exeter in the House of Lords he was told that the Crown would not present an unworthy candidate, and that the questions as to character were only a matter of form. In the end the archbishop of Canterbury was forced to obey the mandate of the Crown, and to consecrate Dr. Hampden. Cardinal Wiseman wrote an article in the *Dublin Review* on this case, pointing out the helplessness of the Anglican Church and its complete dependence on the Crown. Pusey tried to defend the Church by throwing the blame upon the bishops, and Archdeacon Manning, though personally much shaken by the incident, tried to justify it on the ground that the charges against Hampden had never been proved.*

But at the same time another event of even greater significance brought out more clearly the absolute subjection of the Anglican Church to the secular power, namely, the appointment by the Crown of the Rev. Mr. Gorham to a parish in Exeter. The bishop of Exeter refused to confirm the appointment on the ground that Gorham, by asserting that the Sacrament of Baptism did not necessarily blot out original sin or confer grace on the child, had attacked the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, as set forth in the Thirty-nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer, and was, therefore, incapable of holding any office in the Anglican Church. Mr. Gorham brought his case against the bishop of Exeter before the Court of Arches, formerly the court of the archbishop of Canterbury, but then composed of laymen, and the dean of the court decided in favour of the bishop. Mr. Gorham carried his appeal before the

* *Life of Manning*, Vol. I., pp. 478-9.

Privy Council, which since 1832 had jurisdiction to decide such cases. It was composed of laymen, but for ecclesiastical trials some clerics were added, and in this particular case the archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the bishop of London were appointed assessors. The hearing of the case began in December, 1849, and in March, 1850, the decision was given annulling the verdict of the Court of Arches, and commanding the bishop of Exeter to institute Mr. Gorham. The court did not claim the right to define matters of faith, but only to interpret the doctrines of the Anglican Church as expressed in the Articles and Formularies; and it decided that, whatever about the theological value of Gorham's views, they were not clearly opposed to the official Anglican creed. The bishop of Exeter forwarded a spirited protest to the archbishop of Canterbury against such a decision, and he was strongly supported by Pusey, Keble, Manning, Wilberforce and Gladstone, but in his further appeals to the courts he was unsuccessful. The bishop of London introduced a bill into the House of Lords proposing to leave such matters to the decision of the bishops, but the motion was resisted as an infringement of the rights of the Crown, and was rejected, only four of the bishops having the courage to vote with the minority. The bishop of Exeter steadily refused to institute Mr. Gorham, but the archbishop of Canterbury, at the command of the Court of Arches, carried out the decision of the Privy Council.*

Once more there were two parties among the High Churchmen, one the extreme section, Maskell, Allies, Bellasis and Manning, and the other Pusey and Keble. The former accused Pusey of having been the first to teach them the idea of an independent Church and a Sacramental system, and of having deserted his post when his whole system was being struck at by the secular courts. Dr. Wiseman, ever on the alert, understood the nature of the crisis, and contributed three very effective articles to the *Dublin Review* (March, 1850),

* *Life of Manning*, Chaps. I., XXV.

while Newman came up to London and delivered his course of *Lectures on Anglican Difficulties* (1850), in which he exposed with merciless logic the utter untenableness of Pusey's position. Once more the secessions from Anglicanism began. Maskell and Henry Wilberforce came over in 1850, and were quickly followed by Allies, Lord Fielding, Bellasis and Monsell, afterwards Lord Emly. Manning himself was in great trouble. It was well known that he considered the cause of Anglicanism as lost, and Gladstone undertook to reconvince him, but without effect. Something was wanting to urge him to take the final step, and that something came in the shape of the agitation against the re-establishment of the Catholic hierarchy. As archdeacon of Chichester he received the order from his bishop to convoke the clergy to petition against the Papal brief. He obeyed, and took the chair at the meeting held on the 17th November, 1850, but when the resolutions were carried he announced that he could not agree with them, and thanked the clergy for all their kindness to him in the past.* On the 8th December he preached his last sermon at Lavington. He did not, however, make his submission to Rome immediately. It was in March, 1851, as Gladstone and he were kneeling together at the Anglican service in the chapel of Buckingham palace, that he whispered to Gladstone that he could no longer receive the Communion, left the chapel,† and formally resigned his mission; and on the 6th April, 1851, he and Hope were received into the Church by Cardinal Wiseman.

The latter was particularly kind to the converts, and many Catholics were scandalised at the rapidity with which Manning received all the ecclesiastical orders, including even the priesthood (15th June, 1851). Having been ordained priest he proceeded to Rome. Faber, one of the earlier converts, was encouraged by Wiseman to open a branch of the Oratory in London, Oakeley

* *Life of Manning*, Vol. I., pp. 575-80.
† *Idem*, p. 617.

was named a canon of Westminster, and Ward, though a layman, was appointed professor of theology in St. Edmund's College, Ware. Newman was particularly busy at this period. He delivered a series of Lectures on the *Present Position of Catholics in England,* in which he attacked the religious intolerance of English Protestantism (1851), and he preached one of his most beautiful Sermons, *The Second Spring,* before the bishops assembled at Oscott for their first synod. He was offered the position of rector of the Catholic University in Dublin, and in Dublin he delivered the series of lectures, afterwards published in book form under the title of *On the Idea of a University.* He engaged a number of his fellow-converts to assist him in the enterprise, notably Allies, Healy Thompson, Le Page Renouf, Ornsby, Aubrey de Vere and Thomas Arnold, hoping by their presence to win the support of the English Catholics for the new institution. But, partly owing to want of funds, partly owing to the want of a university charter, and partly to misunderstandings among the university trustees, the university did not succeed, and Newman resigned the rectorate (1858), and returned to the Oratory at Edgbaston.

Cardinal Wiseman was particularly busy at this period. In 1852, he presided over the first provincial synod, held at Oscott, which was called upon to legislate on very difficult matters concerning the erection of chapters, the method of electing bishops, the position of rectors, and the rules for ecclesiastical colleges. He went to Rome in 1853 in order to meet certain charges of arbitrary rule made against him, and to settle disputes which had arisen in England about parochial matters, about the jurisdiction of the bishops in regard to the colleges, and about the Oratorians, &c. While there he began the story, *Fabiola,* which was published towards the end of 1854, and which elicited universal applause in England and on the Continent. He was present at Rome for the definition of the Immacu-

late Conception, and on his return to England, delivered a series of lectures at the cathedral on the Austrian Concordat (1855), then very severely criticised by the Protestant press of England. Dr. Manning had returned to England, and Cardinal Wiseman, not quite satisfied with the work done by the existing religious orders, commissioned him to found a society of secular priests, who might assist in evangelising the poorer districts, and in giving diocesan missions. In accordance with the wishes of the cardinal, Manning founded the Oblates of St. Charles in 1857,* and about the same time he was appointed provost of the Westminster Cathedral.

But things had not been moving peacefully in English Catholic circles since 1850. The old jealousies between the Catholics by birth and the converts still continued. Some of the priests thought that the establishment of the hierarchy should have meant the establishment of parochial rights, while some of the bishops thought that Cardinal Wiseman was claiming too much control over the ecclesiastical colleges. Many people objected to the rapid promotion of Manning, others thought it a scandal that a layman like Ward should be entrusted with the chair of theology at St. Edmund's, while even Newman publicly reprobated the "Italian devotions" of Father Faber and the London Oratory. Unfortunately, the controversies took a personal issue in the dispute that broke out between the Cardinal and his coadjutor, Dr. Errington.

Dr. Errington had been the life-long friend of Wiseman, first at Ushaw, then at Rome, and at Oscott. When in 1855 Wiseman determined to secure the appointment of a coadjutor he turned naturally to Dr. Errington, then bishop of Plymouth, and after some hesitation and mutual explanations Dr. Errington accepted the appointment in 1855. The cardinal wanted a coadjutor who would carry out the instructions and the policy traced out for him, while Dr. Errington came to Westminster

* *Life of Manning*, Vol. II., Chap. IV. *Life of Wiseman*, Vol. II., Chap. XXV.

expecting to be allowed a free hand. Naturally it was not long till disagreements sprang up, first about the position of Ward in St. Edmund's, and then about Manning and the Oblates.

The chapter of Westminster, influenced no doubt by the Gallicanism of earlier days, and annoyed at the appointment of Dr. Manning to the provostship, demanded that Manning should submit the rules for the Oblates' congregation for the approval of the chapter, a demand with which Dr. Manning refused to comply. The chapter was supported in its action by Dr. Errington, while Cardinal Wiseman took the side of Manning. The dispute was referred to Rome for settlement (1858), and though Pius IX. was personally on the side of the cardinal, the Prefect of the Propaganda rather disapproved of the non-observance of the canonical formalities by Cardinal Wiseman. Were it not for the able conduct of the case by Manning, through Mgr. Talbot, the verdict might have been unfavourable. In the end the dispute was referred to a synod of the English bishops (1859). The synod was held at Oscott in July in 1859, and Dr. Errington made a bad impression on the bishops by his constant opposition to the views of the cardinal. The claims of the chapter to a voice in the government of the existing colleges were disallowed, and the chapter of Westminster made a graceful submission to the decision.

But after what had happened it was evident that Dr. Errington's retention of the office of coadjutor was likely to lead to constant bickerings and factionism. Dr. Wiseman went to Rome to petition for his removal, and also to secure a verdict on the differences between himself and some of the bishops regarding the government of the ecclesiastical colleges. Having heard a full statement of the case, Pius IX. appealed to Dr. Errington to resign and accept another office, but Dr. Errington, feeling himself aggrieved at the charges of Gallicanism brought against him, refused to comply, but expressed his readiness to submit willingly to depri-

vation. After all other means of settlement were exhausted, the Pope cancelled his appointment (2nd July, 1860), and Dr. Errington retired into private life without a murmur of complaint. On the question of the government of the colleges, however, the decision was against the cardinal.*

The question of Liberal Catholicism in England also demanded attention. During the great Catholic revival on the Continent in the first half of the nineteenth century the advanced party in the movement came to be regarded as Liberal Catholics. The designation "Liberal" was not meant to indicate that they shared in the views of the unorthodox Liberalism of the day, but only that they reserved to themselves the fullest freedom for investigation and discussion consistent with the defined Catholic doctrine. Montalembert and Lacordaire in France, and Döllinger in Germany, were typical representatives of the school. In England, too, there was a small Liberal school, the most prominent of which was Sir John Acton, the pupil and intimate friend of Döllinger. In 1848, John Moore Capes, one of the 1845 converts, founded the *Rambler* to give expression to the views of his party, and he was supported by a great many of the converts. It was independent of episcopal control, and was to be devoted to the free discussion of historical, philosophical and scientific questions, irrespective of results, and without any reference to the conclusions of Catholic theologians. Dr. Wiseman, though naturally anxious for the future of the *Dublin Review*, raised no objection against the policy of the *Rambler*; but as it adopted a very offensive tone in regard to the old English Catholics, their systems of education, and their narrow, bigoted views, the cardinal showed his displeasure, and replied to their criticisms in an article in the *Dublin Review* (Jan., 1857).† To counteract the influence of this school, Cardinal Wiseman secured the co-operation of Ward for the *Dublin Review* in 1858.

* *Life of Wiseman*, Chaps. II., XXV., XXVII. *Life of Manning*, Vol. II., pp. 75-150.

† *Lord Acton and His Circle*, Chaps. XXXI.-XXXV.

This selection was not likely to bring peace, for if Simpson and his friends erred on the side of liberty, Ward went to the other extreme on the side of authority. Manning, Faber, and Dalgairns also supported the *Dublin Review*. Both parties sought the co-operation of Newman, but not being able to approve of the policy of either one or the other he kept aloof from the discussion. In 1859, the bishops considered the question of issuing a condemnation of the *Rambler*, but before doing so they requested Newman to interview the editors. He did so, and secured the withdrawal of Simpson from the editorial chair. He himself, for the sake of peace, undertook to edit the magazine, but owing to the difficulties of doing so without committing himself to a party he resigned in July, 1859. In 1862, the *Rambler* was changed into the *Home and Foreign Review*, but its policy was still the same, and in the same year it was condemned by the bishops. Ward now became editor of the *Dublin Review* (1862), and during the stormy years of 1862 and 1863, when the discussions between the "Liberals" and "Ultramontanes" were at their height, and when, owing to the debates at the Mechlin and Munich Congresses in 1863, and the Papal letter to the archbishop of Munich, feeling ran high in England, Ward was particularly strong in his attacks on Liberalism. The issue of the Syllabus and the Bull, *Quanta Cura*, in 1864 encouraged him in his policy, while, on the other hand, the editors of the *Home and Foreign Review*, unable to agree with the tenor of the Papal documents, and unwilling to oppose, ceased publication.*

If Newman succeeded in keeping clear of these discussions he was involved in others equally trying. Ever since his conversion he had been regarded by his former co-religionists with suspicion and distrust. They considered that he had remained in their communion long after he had made up his mind to join Rome, and that

* *Lord Acton and His Circle*, Chaps. LXV.-LXXVII. *William George Ward*, pp. 142-88.

he had done so that he might use his position to bring over with him as many as possible. These suspicions were a common subject of private conversation, but it was only in 1864 that the Rev. Charles Kingsley, in a review of Froude's *History of England,* ventured to publish them in the columns of *MacMillan's Review.* In this he asserted "that Truth was never a virtue with the Roman clergy, and that Father Newman had said that it need not be so, and that cunning was the weapon which Heaven had given to the Saints for their defence." The article having been brought under Newman's notice, he demanded that Kingsley should point out where he (Newman) had made such a statement. Kingsley gave an evasive answer, stating he relied upon passages in Newman's sermons, and more especially on one sermon entitled "Wisdom and Innocence." This naturally annoyed Newman, who thought that such a specific charge should be supported by some specific evidence, and he refused to accept the imperfect apology which Kingsley inserted in *MacMillan's Review.* To the letter of Newman, Kingsley issued a rejoinder, *What then does Dr. Newman mean?* This determined Newman to submit the story of his life to the English people, and let them judge for themselves if he was guilty of the deceit that had been charged against him. The *Apologia* was published in seven parts, between 21st April and 2nd June, 1864, and never was a publication so successful in its object. It not only completely overpowered Kingsley, but it won for Newman the support and admiration of all classes of his countrymen, and did much to produce a better understanding of the Catholic position.

Having failed to establish in Dublin what he hoped might have been a university for the Catholics of the three kingdoms, Dr. Newman thought of founding a college for Catholics in connection with Oxford university. The test for matriculation had been removed in 1854, and Newman thought that Catholics would go there in any case, and that it would be better to provide

a hall by means of which they might be kept together, and the dangers of university life considerably lessened. But suspicions of Newman's Liberalism and of his secret understanding with the Liberal school had gone abroad, and his scheme met with opposition. In 1864, with the approval of his bishop, Dr. Ullathorne, he secured a piece of land at Oxford, and announced his intention of erecting a church, mainly for the convenience of the students. This might have escaped criticism had it not been for the bitter discussions already raging between the *Dublin Review* and *The Home and Foreign Review* on the subject of education, and in the course of which very acrimonious attacks were made upon Cardinal Wiseman and Manning. The latter, though formerly on very friendly terms with Newman, had conceived a distrust of his theological views about 1859, and from that time seemed to consider Newman as a dangerous ally of the Liberal school. The proposed foundation was brought under the notice of Propaganda, and the Propaganda applied to the English bishops for an expression of opinion. They met in 1864, and decided that the foundation was inopportune. Newman announced to Dr. Ullathorne his submission to the decision, and his abandonment of the scheme.*

Such an attitude towards Newman was not according to the traditional policy of Cardinal Wiseman, but the unjustified attacks of the *Home and Foreign Review* party had alienated his sympathy and had driven him more and more into the camp of Manning and Ward. Even in his old age the cardinal displayed his wonderful activity by taking part in the Mechlin Congress (1863), and in all kinds of discussions at various learned societies and associations in England. It was while he was preparing a lecture for the Shakespeare centenary celebrations that he took suddenly ill (Jan., 1865), and on the 16th February he passed away. But his work as an ecclesiastic and as a scholar still remains. Judging

Life of Wiseman, Vol. II., p. 477. *William George Ward*, Chap. VIII.

him by whatever standard one might care to apply, it is not easy to find his equal among the churchmen of the nineteenth century.

The election of a successor to Cardinal Wiseman was specially difficult on account of the previous disputes with the chapter and Dr. Errington. Most men believed that Dr. Manning alone was worthy to occupy such an important see, but when the chapter met (14th March, 1865) they put forward the names of Dr. Errington, the former coadjutor, Dr. Clifford, bishop of Clifton, and Dr. Grant of Southwark. Pius IX. resented the action of the chapter in placing Dr. Errington first on its list as a personal insult, and, in spite of the misgivings of Cardinal Barnabo, he took the matter into his own hands, and appointed Dr. Manning archbishop of Westminster. It was feared by some that such a step might provoke angry discussions, and possibly schism, but the groundlessness of such fears was proved by the warm welcome given to the new archbishop by his former opponents.*

Dr. Manning was a man of great administrative ability, and he devoted his energies to the erection of churches, especially in the poorer quarters, in securing more clergy so that the spiritual wants of his flock might be well looked after, and in the erection of schools. Unfortunately, the misunderstandings between himself and Dr. Newman were not cleared up, and the action of Manning in securing another prohibition against a second attempt at founding a Catholic Hall at Oxford (1867) did not tend to bring about better relations.† Newman, worn out by his disappointments, retired from active life, and in the quietude of Edgbaston set himself to compose the *Grammar of Assent,* which served as a kind of complement to the *Essay on Development* of 1845. It was an attempt to subject the act of faith to a careful analysis and to establish for faith a sound philosophical basis. In 1867, Pius IX. announced his intention of convoking a General Council, and very soon the

* *Life of Manning*, Vol. II., Chap. X.
† *Idem.*, pp. 290-303.

controversy on Papal Infallibility broke out in France, Italy and Germany. While Louis Veuillot and the *Civiltà* were strongly in favour of such a definition, the Munich school, led by Döllinger, began a bitter opposition. Both parties had their followers in England. Dr. Manning and Ward supported the definition, and Lord Acton and the former *Rambler* party took the side of Döllinger.* Lord Acton spared neither argument nor invective to cast ridicule on the doctrine and its supporters. Newman tried, as formerly, to keep aloof from the controversy, but personally he was prepared to accept the doctrine if defined, though he believed the definition to be inopportune.

As the time for the Council approached, Dr. Manning showed himself more strongly as a leader in the movement for Infallibility, while it was noticed that Newman was not invited to take any part in the preparatory commissions. In a confidential letter written to his own bishop, Dr. Ullathorne, Newman expressed the view that when there was no heresy threatening the Church such a definition was uncalled for, and that, though if Providence permitted it to pass he was prepared to accept it, still he believed it would have an injurious effect on those outside the Church, and retard the progress of Catholicity.† The letter was never meant for publication, but by some mistake it got into the press, and increased the difficulties of Newman's position.

During the Council (1869-70) Manning played a most prominent part. Nor was his activity confined merely to the assembly itself. To him in a great measure is due the honour of counteracting the influence of those who urged England to join the other powers in a protest against Infallibility. He had frequent interviews with Russell, the English agent at Rome, and Gladstone, following the advice of Russell, refused to interfere in the proceedings of the Council.‡ When the definition

* *Life of Manning*, Vol. II., Chap. XVI. *W. G. Ward*, Chap. X.
† Hutton, *Life of Newman*, pp. 239-40.
‡ *Life of Manning*, Vol. II., Chap. XVI.

of Infallibility was passed in July, 1870, Manning returned to England, and did good work by a series of lectures, in which he set forth the true meaning of Infallibility, and refuted the rumours that had been set on foot about the treatment meted out to the minority at the Council. Speculation was rife as to the attitude that Newman would assume, but all doubt was soon set at rest by a letter to a friend the day after the definition, announcing that he fully accepted it. Acton and his friends remained sullen but not openly rebellious, and when, in 1874, Lord Acton was requested by his bishop to explain his attitude he gave a reply that was deemed satisfactory. Though some of his later writings on the subject are sufficiently extreme, he never broke from the Church, and died as a good Catholic in 1902, *Regius* professor of history at Cambridge.* Some of the Anglican bishops attended the Old Catholic conference at Cologne in 1872 in order to bring about a union between the Anglicans, Easterns and Old Catholics, but the attempts proved a failure. In recent times (1908) an Old Catholic bishop has been appointed in England.

The popular feeling in England was strongly aroused by the definition, and meetings were held to condemn Papal Infallibility and to express sympathy with the German Emperor and Bismarck in their campaign against the Catholics. Gladstone, who had been defeated in the House of Commons on the Irish University Bill (1873), and in his appeal to the country in 1874, retired from political life, and devoted his spare time to religious controversy. In December, 1874, he published his pamphlet on *The Vatican Decrees in their bearing on Civil Allegiance*, in which he asserted that the Vatican Council, by putting such power in the hands of the Pope, had introduced a new church and a new religion, namely, Vaticanism, that the Pope's power in civil as well as in religious matters was thenceforth without any limit, and that, therefore, loyalty to the Pope was incompatible with civil allegiance. Such a

* *Lord Acton and His Circle*, pp. 358-70.

pamphlet, coming from a man of Gladstone's standing and well-known moderation, produced a painful effect in England, and the necessity of issuing a good reply was felt by all. Manning wrote an able reply,* as did several others, but the one that attracted the most notice was that written by Newman as a *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*. In this Dr. Newman put aside as worthless the exaggerated interpretations that had been put upon the definition by some Catholics,† and he pointed out that, understood in the true sense, it gave the Pope no greater power in civil matters than he had already possessed. In reference to the objections brought forward by Döllinger, he remarked that Döllinger seemed to have greater confidence in his own historical infallibility than in that of the Holy Ghost guiding the Church; and in the end he declared his loyal submission to Rome. Gladstone continued the attack in the *Quarterly Review* (January), in the pamphlet, *Vaticanism* (1875), in which he replied to his critics, and in the volume, *Rome and the Newest Fashions in Religion*.‡

In the midst of all his controversies Manning did not forget his work as archbishop. He was extremely anxious for the education and spiritual welfare, especially of the poorer classes in London; and having seen with his own eyes the awful havoc caused by excessive drinking he founded a Total Abstinence society, the League of the Cross, and in order to give good example himself took the pledge against alcoholic drink, and kept it strictly to the end. He used to attend the annual procession of his Total Abstinence recruits, and march with them through the streets of London. On the other hand, like Cardinal Wiseman, he was anxious that Catholics should take a due share in the public life of the country, and to give them a good example in this respect he attended public meetings and discussions, and was

* *The Vatican Decrees in their bearing upon Civil Allegiance*, London, 1875.

† Ward, *De Infallibilitatis Extensione*, 1869.

‡ Morley, *Life of Gladstone*, Vol. II., pp. 513-22.

an active member of the Metaphysical Society till its dissolution in 1880, and of the Athenæum Club.

The attendance of Catholic students at the national universities was still a cause of irritation, as some Catholics were anxious to send their boys there after the complete abolition of the tests, but Manning was still opposed to such action, and secured a renewal of the prohibition in 1872, but he felt that the prohibition would be useless unless he could provide a means of higher Catholic education independent of Oxford or Cambridge. In 1873 he proposed, at a meeting of the bishops, that a house of higher studies should be founded at Kensington, and the proposition was accepted.

Funds were subscribed, and the institution was opened in 1874, but for several reasons it proved a complete failure. Manning apparently wished to control the foundation himself, and though he agreed to accept a council of laymen selected from the different dioceses the council had little or no voice in the management of affairs. Mgr. Capel, a man of no special ability or university experience, was selected as rector, and succeeded in bringing together a certain number of professors. But the number of students, small at best, began to decrease, the debts began to accumulate, the services of some of the professors had, consequently, to be dispensed with, and, in the end, the attempt was abandoned as a hopeless failure (1878).*

The university education of English Catholics still remained to be settled. Another attempt was made to secure the withdrawal of the prohibition in 1882, but it was defeated in Rome in 1883 and 1885. But towards the end of his reign, Leo XIII. (1895) gave way, and allowed Catholics to attend the national universities, with certain restrictions and conditions. Halls have been established at Oxford and Cambridge, and a certain number of English Catholics now frequent both universities.

* *Life of Manning*, Vol., II., pp. 494-504.

When Pius IX. died, in 1878, and when a new Pope, Leo XIII., was elected, many English Catholics believed that the time had come when some honour should be done to Newman in recognition of his great services and ability. A deputation waited on Manning, who himself had been created cardinal in 1875, to join them in a petition to Rome, requesting the cardinal's hat for Newman. Cardinal Manning agreed to their request, and Leo XIII., who had a great personal admiration for Newman, readily acceded to the petition. In March, 1879, the official announcement of his coming promotion was made to Newman. The news made a good impression in England, and was hailed with almost equal satisfaction by Anglicans and Catholics.* Newman set out for Rome, where he arrived in April, and received a highly gratifying reception from both Pope and cardinals. On his return to England he held a grand reception in London (1880), and visited Oxford, where he was received with every mark of honour and respect.

Cardinal Manning was always remarkable for his sympathy for the poor; and, as he grew older, and as he studied more closely the political power of the working classes, and their miserable social condition, he began to realise that the future progress of the Church depended largely on the attitude it assumed towards the working classes. Hence, he was anxious to keep the Church in England free from any alliance with the government, such as might be implied by the residence of a Papal legate in London,† and he strove to awaken in Catholic circles an interest in the social problem. In his famous lecture on *The Rights and Dignity of Labour* he pointed out the abuses of Capitalism, and declared that they could be remedied only by state legislation. It is interesting to note that he was willing to allow state interference, not only in regard to the conditions and hours of labour, but also

* *Life of Newman*, p. 243. *Life of Manning*, pp. 553-73.
† *Idem.*, Vol. II., pp. 740-43.

on the question of wages, though on this point, he confessed, recourse should be had to legislation only as little as possible.

In 1887, he strongly supported Cardinal Gibbons in his efforts to secure toleration for the Knights of Labour; and in 1889, when 200,000 of the London dockers went on strike, and when the Lord Mayor of London appealed for arbitration, Cardinal Manning offered to join the bishop of London in an attempt at settlement. The bishop soon withdrew, frightened by the difficulties and the responsibility of his task, but the cardinal persevered, threatening and appealing to the employers and employees in turn till he secured an agreement of both parties to certain terms. A hitch, however, occurred about some points of detail, and he was obliged again to undertake the task of winning over the men. He met their leaders in one of his schools, and for fully five hours he reasoned with them on the advantages of the compromise, and the misery they were bringing upon their families by persisting in their stubborn attitude, and in the end, touched by the earnestness and sympathy of the kindly old man, they yielded, and the great strike was at an end. His success as arbitrator made him immensely popular with all classes in England, as was shown in the following year (1890), the jubilee of his episcopate, when addresses of congratulation poured in on him from all sides, not alone from England, but from Germany, America and Australia. Mr. Parnell headed a deputation of the Irish Nationalist Members of Parliament on this occasion, and he had good reason, for Cardinal Manning, besides taking a warm interest in the poor Irish immigrants of his flock, had made no secret of his sympathy with Irish demands, and had interfered in Rome to warn the authorities against anti-Irish intriguers.*

The two great men, who had been so prominent in Catholic affairs for nearly half a century, Newman and Manning, were fast approaching their end. Cardinal

* *Life of Manning*, Vol. II., pp. 617-29.

Newman spent the last years of his life at Edgbaston in prayer and contemplation. The end came suddenly, after two days' sickness (11th August, 1890). The funeral service was celebrated in the Oratory at Birmingham, and was attended not only by the bishops and clergy, but by the leading men of the country. The Anglican clergy were strongly represented, as was the University of Oxford. A solemn Requiem Mass was celebrated in London, at which Cardinal Manning himself pronounced a striking panegyric.

Cardinal Manning was then very weak, but he retained his mental vigour to the last. His notes on the obstacles to the progress of Catholicity, made about 1890, are a sufficient proof that his mind was still active. But in 1892 he was attacked by sickness. On the 13th January he made the profession of faith in the presence of his chapter, and he died on the following day. His death was mourned by all parties in England as a great national calamity.

Dr. Vaughan, bishop of Salford, succeeded to Westminster. He set himself from the beginning to erect a cathedral that might be worthy of the Catholic Church in England. To Francis Bentley was committed the task of preparing the plans of the new building, and he decided that the new cathedral should be in the Byzantine style. The work of collecting funds for such an immense undertaking involved great labour, but the appeals for assistance met with a generous response. Close on £250,000 have been subscribed, and though the cathedral is still far from being completed, it has been open for worship since 1903. In 1895, the prohibition against the attendance of Catholics at Oxford and Cambridge universities was removed, and the bishops of England were instructed to make proper provision for the religious wants and education of the Catholics attending those establishments.

It was during Cardinal Vaughan's tenure of office as archbishop of Westminster that the question of the

validity of Anglican orders reached its final stage.* Lord Halifax, the leader of the English Church Union, was anxious to take up the old idea of a corporative reunion between the Roman and Anglican Churches. His ideas on the question, both on the meaning of a corporative union and on the attempts to procure individual conversions from Anglicanism to Catholicism, being so very different from those held by Catholics, his proposals met with little favour in England. In 1889, while wintering at Madeira, he was brought into contact with a French priest, M. L'Abbé Portal, who listened attentively to his schemes, and agreed with him as to the necessity of bringing about a better understanding between English Catholics and Anglicans. In order to afford a common platform for discussion, M. Portal, under the *nom-de-plume* Dalbus, published a pamphlet on Anglican Orders, in which, while pointing out that the historical arguments against their validity were worthless, he based the argument for their invalidity on the fact that the matter and form of the sacrament of orders, as prescribed by the Church, had not been retained. The pamphlet was written in a friendly tone, as was also an article by the Abbé Duchesne on the same subject in the *Bulletin Critique*.

From 1890 till 1895 the movement towards reunion gathered force in England, and the friendly relations between the leaders in England and certain French ecclesiastics were continued. Archbishop Benson published a letter in 1894, rejecting the idea of a reunion unless on condition that Rome abandoned its anti-scriptural teaching, and advocating the theory that though a union between the three great branches of the Christian Church was obligatory, the obligation was temporarily suspended owing to the circumstances. In 1895, the *Church Union* insisted strongly that all efforts should be concentrated upon a corporative reunion, and depre-

* For Anglican Orders, *cf.*:—Estcourt, *The Question of Anglican Ordinations*, London, 1873. Barnes, *The Pope and the Ordinal*, London, 1898. Smith, *Reasons for Rejecting Anglican Orders*, London, 1896. *Tablet*, 1895, 1896.

cated the attempts at perversion and the attacks made upon their orders by English Catholics.

Leo XIII. had been kept in close touch with all the developments by Abbé Portal and his friends, and, judging the circumstances favourable, he took the important step of addressing an Encyclical letter to the English people (*Ad Anglos*, 15th April, 1895). In this document he recalled the conversion of England by St. Augustine, a missionary sent by Rome, and the glories of English Catholicism in the succeeding ages; he deplored the disunion that had been effected in the sixteenth century, and recalled the efforts made by the Popes to heal the schism; he praised the work done by the Anglican Church in its defence of the great dogmas of Christianity, and he begged them to pray for the light that would enable them to put an end to the disunion. The letter made a very favourable impression in England, and was welcomed by journals of all shades of opinion. The primate, Dr. Benson, issued a pastoral in reply, in which, having expressed his gratitude to Leo XIII. for his kindly interest, he declared there could be no reunion at the sacrifice of doctrine; and even Lord Halifax seems to have been of the same mind. The French Catholics, not understanding the state of affairs, thought that reunion was only a matter of time, and they could see no justification for the gloomy view of the situation taken by Cardinal Vaughan and the English Catholics. They attributed this attitude to the bigotry born of centuries of persecution, when in reality it was due to the fact that the English Catholics understood the doctrinal views of Lord Halifax and his friends better than the French party, and knew that even though the *Church Union* were to join Rome it could have little effect on the mass of the English people. The *Revue Anglo-Romaine* was founded at Paris to promote the reunion movement.

In 1895, Lord Halifax was received in audience by the Pope, and rumours of all kinds were afloat regarding the attitude of Rome on the question of Anglican

orders. The absence of any reference to the controversy in the Papal Encyclical was claimed by some people as an evidence that the Pope admitted their validity. In these circumstances it was important to arrive at an authoritative decision, and, therefore, the Pope appointed a commission charged with the investigation of the subject. Cardinal Mazzella was the president of this body, and the present Secretary of State, Cardinal Merry del Val acted as secretary, the others being Dom Gasquet, Father David Fleming, Canon Moyes, Abbé Duchesne, Padre de Augustinis, Dr. Scannell, Mgr. Gasparri, and Father Llevaneras, a Spanish Capuchin. The commission was very representative, consisting of men who were already conversant with the question, and had already arrived at different conclusions. The defenders of the validity of the Anglican orders and the friends of the reunion movement were represented at Rome by the Abbé Portal and by two Anglican clergymen. Gladstone wrote a pamphlet against the condemnation of the Anglican orders and forwarded copies of it to Rome.

The commission opened in 1896, and the decision was formally promulgated in the Encyclical, *Apostolicae Curae* (15th Sept., 1896). The Pope began by recalling the attitude maintained by the Holy See on this question since the days of Edward VI. He pointed out that both Julius II. and Paul IV. regarded those ordained according to the Edwardine ritual as men without orders. Similar decisions were arrived at in 1684, and in the case of Gordon in 1784. The Pope proceeded to justify these decisions on theological grounds by pointing out that the words used in the ordination of priests and bishops, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum,* not being expressive of the sacerdotal office, and too general in their signification, could not confer a valid sacrament; and that, the form having been corrupted with the obvious intention of omitting reference to the sacrificial power of the priests, it might well be contended that the intention required for the valid conferring of a sacrament, namely,

the intention of doing what the Church does, was also absent.

The decision was a great blow to many of the Anglican clergy, and while it drove some to join the Catholic community, it lashed others into a fury against the Papacy. Lord Halifax, the *Church Times,* and the *Guardian* were strong in their condemnation of the Encyclical. The archbishops of Canterbury and York issued a Latin address to the bishops of the world (March, 1897) in opposition to the letter of the Pope, and the Lambeth Conference in 1897 confined itself to general declarations about the desirability of reunion. The Low Church party and the Dissenters rather rejoiced at the blow given by Rome to the hopes of the High Churchmen, especially as the question of the validity or invalidity of Anglican orders interested them very little. The French school of ecclesiastics who were gathered round the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* were disconcerted by the publication of the Encyclical. They had hoped, if not for a favourable decision, at least, for a delay of sentence, and when the condemnation appeared they hastened to give it the mildest interpretation, and even hinted that it might not be considered as final. But the Pope addressed a letter to the archbishop of Paris (5th Nov., 1896), in which he reproved the writers in the *Revue Anglo-Romaine,* and declared that Catholics should accept the decree as fixed, definitive, and irrevocable. Cardinal Vaughan and English Catholics generally welcomed and defended the Encyclical.

The closing years of Cardinal Vaughan's life were disturbed by the conflict regarding the primary schools. Till 1833 the state, as in most other countries, left education in the hands of private associations, mostly of a religious character. In 1833 a system of dividing an annual grant between the two principal educational societies, the National and the British and Foreign Education Society, was introduced.* Both these were

* Lilly and Wallis, *Manual of Law Specially Affecting Catholics,* London, 1893, pp. 106-35.

Protestant, but in 1847 Catholic schools were admitted to a share of the annual subsidy, and the Catholic Poor School Committee was founded to supervise and direct the Catholic primary schools. In 1853, the system of paying by capitation grants was introduced. Complaints were, however, made that the free educational societies neglected to provide sufficiently for the wants of certain districts, and the Nonconformists began to complain of the control exercised by the members of the Established Church. In response to these complaints the Act of 1870 was introduced and passed. The object of this measure was not to supplant the free schools, but only to supplement them. Wherever the voluntary school authorities were unable or unwilling to provide sufficient accommodation, or wherever the county or borough council or a majority of the ratepayers demanded it, a local school board could be erected and empowered to levy rates for the erection and maintenance of schools. Gradually, however, the school boards, having at their disposal immense funds, rendered the position of the voluntary schools more difficult, and at last threatened to extinguish them. In order to improve the position of the voluntary schools, and to introduce more equality in the treatment meted out to both classes of schools, the Education Act of 1902 was passed. By this Act the school boards and school attendance committees were abolished, and their place was taken by committees appointed by the local authorities (the county or borough councils). All schools were placed under public control, but in the case of the voluntary schools it was provided that a majority of the school committee should represent the foundation managers. In regard to secular matters the schools were to be under the control of the local educational authorities.

This measure was of great advantage to the Catholic schools by admitting them to a share of the educational grants, but since the advent of the Liberal party to power in 1905, various attempts have been made to do away with the safeguards provided for the voluntary

schools, and to subject the schools completely to the control of the local educational authorities. These measures have failed, owing mainly to the opposition offered by the Irish Nationalist party in Parliament. The religious character of the Catholic training colleges for teachers is, however, seriously endangered by the regulations of 1908. In 1906, there were in England 1,070 Catholic schools with 412,669 pupils. During the struggle for Catholic education the Catholic Education Council has done good service. Catholic secondary education in England is well organised, as is shown by the progress of such establishments as Downside, Stonyhurst, Ampleforth, Beaumont, Ushaw, Edgbaston. The regulations published in 1908, if strictly enforced, are likely to prove a great hardship to Catholic secondary schools.*

The Catholic body in England is well organised. Besides the Education Council established to supervise and defend the Catholic schools, the Catholic Union of Great Britain was founded in 1871 to promote the general Catholic interests, and in 1891 the Catholic Association was founded to promote greater unity and good fellowship amongst Catholics. The Catholic Truth Society, established in 1884, mainly owing to the exertions of the late Cardinal Vaughan, then rector of Mill Hill College, has done much to provide a Catholic literature, and to refute the calumnies so often circulated against Catholics.

(*d*) Anglicanism

Church, *The Oxford Movement*, London, 1891. Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, London, 1891. Lock, *John Keble, A Biography*, London, 1893. Moule, *The Evangelical School in the Church of England*, London, 1901. Davidson, *Life of Dr. Tait*, London, 1891. Moyes, *Aspects of Anglicanism*, London. Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*

The helplessness of the Anglican Church and its complete dependence upon the civil authority had been amply demonstrated in the proceedings against

* *Report of the Board of Education*, 1907-8, p. 47.

Hampden and Gorham. In order to counteract the disagreeable impression made by these decisions, the High Church party, Pusey, Keble, Wilberforce, the bishop of Oxford, and Gladstone strove hard to secure the appointment of a purely ecclesiastical court of appeal, but they were divided among themselves, and were unable to win over their brethren to any such scheme. On the contrary, the interference of the secular authorities in Church matters seemed to increase. In 1857, the Divorce Bill was introduced, abolishing the costly formalities which up to that time had made divorce almost impossible. The High Church party naturally opposed such an innovation, and Gladstone fought the bill clause by clause in the House of Commons. But when it came before the House of Lords it was supported by the primate and by some of the bishops. When it became law the bishops authorised their clergy to marry divorced persons, and to give them the Holy Communion after such marriages.

In 1853, Pusey preached a sermon on the Holy Eucharist, in which he strongly insisted upon the real objective Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, though he rejected the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation. The sermon raised no immediate outcry, and his party began to boast that, at last, the Anglican Church accepted the true Catholic doctrine on the Eucharist, but they were soon undeceived. In the same year archdeacon Denison preached on the same subject, and was cited before the archbishop of Canterbury for having taught that the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist ought to be worshipped, and that unbelievers and sinners, as well as the faithful, receive the Body and Blood in receiving the Sacrament. The archbishop decided that such doctrines were incompatible with the articles of the Anglican Church, but on appeal to the Court of Arches and the Privy Council his judgment was set aside by reason of certain informalities. Hardly had this case been settled when the discussion broke out in a more aggravated form. Forbes, the High Church

bishop of Brechin, published a pastoral in 1857, in which he asserted that the Eucharistic Sacrifice was identical with that of the Cross, and that supreme adoration was due to the Body and Blood of Christ present in the sacramental species. The bishops of Scotland were horrified at such teaching, and summoned the bishop of Brechin to appear before the synod. They decided (1858) that the doctrines of the bishop were irreconcilable with the Anglican creed, but as the bishop had not put forward such opinions as the teaching of the Church, they should refrain from any further action. These decisions should have sufficed to convince Pusey that the official Anglican Church rejected the *Via Media,* by means of which he was striving to retain his followers from seceding to Rome.

Up to this period the struggle had been between the *High Church* party and the *Evangelicals* or *Low Church* body, but now both were obliged to join hands against a common enemy that appeared to disturb the peace of the Anglican Church, namely, the *Broad Church*. This was a survival of the Liberal school of Arnold, which, after the departure of Newman and his friends from Oxford, began to develop rapidly in the university and throughout the country. It took its inspiration partly from the liberal tendencies of the age, partly from the German school of biblical critics, whose conclusions seemed to overturn many of the religious positions which had been hitherto regarded as safe. Stanley and Jowett may be regarded as the great representatives of this party at Oxford, and their influence as professors and writers contributed much to spread the same opinions in the country. It is difficult to define precisely the position of the *Broad Church,* as the different individuals, or at least different groups, held widely different views on what might be regarded as fundamental questions; but in general it might be said that the *Broad Church* was distinguished by its aversion for sacerdotalism, for the old-fashioned orthodoxy which regarded every man a heretic who did not believe up to

its own standard, and for a church authority which claimed the right of fixing the creed of its followers. They wanted a national Church, wide enough for all who accepted the great dogmas, and they insisted on the necessity of state supremacy to guard the faithful from clerical intolerance and theological fanaticism. Needless to say, they detested Pusey and the High Churchmen, while the latter looked upon them as little less than religious sceptics.

In 1860, a book, entitled *Essays and Reviews,* consisting of seven articles written by different men, and of very varying degrees of orthodoxy, was published. It was soon denounced by Bishop Wilberforce of Oxford and by Pusey and Keble. The *Low Church* joined the *High Church* in condemning the opinions expressed in the volume, and the bishops, forced by the demands of the clergy, issued a letter in 1861, which, without naming the book, expressed their pain at seeing clergymen put forward such views. The letter was signed by twenty-four bishops. Wilberforce succeeded in securing that the book should be considered by a synod of the bishops. But as two of the essayists, Williams and Wilson, had been already cited before the courts, such synodal action was deferred. The bishop of Salisbury brought the case of Williams and Wilson before the Court of Arches, which decided in 1862 that as a punishment for having denied the inspiration of the Scriptures, and the eternity of punishment, they should be suspended for one year. The two clergymen appealed to the Privy Council, and the appeal was heard in June, 1863, before a court consisting of four laymen and three ecclesiastics, the archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the bishop of London. After a delay of eight months the decision was given (8th Feb., 1864) by the Lord Chancellor, who announced that as the statements made by these writers did not directly oppose the creed or formularies of the Anglican Church, the court reversed the former decision and acquitted the accused. He added, however, that on the question of inspiration

the archbishops were opposed to the opinions of the majority.*

The decision, while highly gratifying to the *Broad Church* party, was a terrible blow to their opponents. Pusey prepared a declaration affirming the belief of the Church in inspiration and in the eternity of punishment, and it was signed by half the clergymen of the Anglican Church, while a similar address received the signature of 137,000 laymen. Wilberforce brought the matter before convocation in 1864, and by a large majority a synodal condemnation of the book was carried on the ground that it contained doctrines contrary to those received by the Church of England in common with the whole Catholic Church. This condemnation was brought under the notice of the House of Lords, and the Lord Chancellor announced that though the condemnation was illegal it was of no importance, and, therefore, did not require the interference of the government.

It was at the same period that the Colenso controversy came to increase the bitterness between the two parties. Dr. Colenso † had been appointed bishop of Natal in 1853, and having laboured for some time among the native tribes he undertook a translation of the bible for their special use. But in the course of his work he was brought face to face with the critical difficulties raised by the German school of critics, and, under the influence of their opinions, he started to compose a volume on the Pentateuch, in which he assailed many of the traditional views, and ended up by rejecting completely the inspiration and divine authority of the Pentateuch. The book was published in two volumes in London (1862-63), and appearing as it did at a time when feeling ran high over the *Essays and Reviews,* it caused a great sensation. Dr. Gray, the metropolitan of South Africa, hurried to London to secure the assistance of the English bishops against his heretical suffragan, but the

* Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, Vol. II., pp. 422-34.
† Cox, *Life of J. W. Colenso,* London, 1888.

bishops were rather embarrassed by his impassioned appeal, and the most he could secure from them was a joint letter addressed to Dr. Colenso in 1863, expressing the opinion that his views were not reconcilable with his position as bishop, and that he should resign. This Dr. Colenso stubbornly refused to do, and on the matter being brought before convocation it was decided that the book contained errors of a dangerous nature, but that as the matter was being brought before the courts convocation refrained from taking any further action.

Dr. Gray, tired of the inactivity of his colleagues in England, returned to the Cape, and cited Dr. Colenso before his tribunal. The latter refused to recognise any such jurisdiction, but in December, 1863, the metropolitan held his court and pronounced sentence of deposition. He announced at the same time that he would recognise no appeal except to the archbishop of Canterbury, and that if the civil authorities forced Dr. Colenso upon him he would excommunicate him, and appoint a successor. Dr. Colenso appealed to the Privy Council, and on the 20th March, 1865, it set aside the verdict that had been pronounced by Dr. Gray. But the metropolitan was not so easily overcome. He promptly excommunicated Dr. Colenso, appealed to the English bishops to support him, and when he found that he could expect no effective help from that quarter he consecrated a successor to Dr. Colenso, and gave the world, and more especially the Zulu converts, the spectacle of two opposing bishops, both professing to follow the Articles of the Anglican Church. Colenso died in 1883.

The Ritualist movement amongst the High Church party was a natural development of the attempts made by the Tractarians to bring about a revival of Catholic doctrine in the Anglican Church. The doctrine of the Real Presence necessitated a change in the churches and in the ceremonial. Keble, Newman, and Pusey began to introduce this change by the erection of altars and crosses, and by the use of a more fitting ceremonial, and some of their disciples went further in that direc-

tion by introducing candles, flowers, vestments, &c. Later on, as the doctrines of the Tractarians took root, societies of the *Holy Cross* and of the *Blessed Sacrament* were formed to defend the adoration of the Cross, the celebration of Mass, the reservation of the Holy Eucharist, and the worship of Christ, present in the Blessed Sacrament. In spite of denunciations to the bishops and lawsuits in the civil courts, the Ritualists refused to abandon their course. In 1856, the more advanced party of the Ritualists, led by Dr. Lee, advocated the necessity of a reunion with Rome, and founded a journal, *The Union,* to advocate their view of a corporate union. They were encouraged by the co-operation of some Catholics, the most prominent of whom was Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle. In 1857, he assisted at a general meeting of the party, and a mixed society, *The Association for the Promotion of the Union of Christendom*, or, as it was more generally known, the A. P. U. C., was established. Such a combination of Catholics and Protestants was opposed by the great body of the Catholics on the grounds that the Catholic and Protestant idea of reunion being so different, the one regarding the Anglican Church as heretical and in schism, the other maintaining that it formed one of the three great branches of the Christian Church, such an association involved a sacrifice of Catholic principle, that it hindered, and was meant to hinder, individual conversions, and that, at best, it could affect only a small portion of the Anglican body.*

It was opposed by Manning, Ward and Cardinal Wiseman. The prefect of the Propaganda signified his disapproval (1857), and, as it was soon noticed that the movement was taking a dangerous turn, the bishops urged the condemnation of the association so far as Catholics were concerned in it in 1864, and in 1865 the Holy Office issued a rescript against such combinations for prayer between Catholics and Protestants. Dr. Manning published this in December, 1865, and a little

* *Life of Wiseman*, pp. 477-88.

later (Feb., 1866) issued a pastoral on the reunion of Christendom, in which he condemned the principle of compromise which underlay the action of the A. P. U. C.; and after such a condemnation there was no other course open for loyal Catholics except to withdraw.* It is remarkable, however, that it was this association which later on gave birth to the *Order of Corporate Reunion*, or the O. C. R., in 1877. It was a secret society, and its object was to remove the doubts existing in many minds regarding the validity of Anglican Orders, by securing the ordination and consecration of some of the members by bishops whose orders were unquestioned. Three of their body were apparently consecrated by a Jansenist bishop in Holland, and returned to England, and probably reordained a certain number of Anglican clergymen, but on account of the secrecy of the proceedings, and the ridicule thrown upon them by all parties, the O. C. R. gradually disappeared from notice.†

In 1859, the Ritualists founded the *English Church Union* with the object of protecting themselves against the Low Church attacks, and of putting down the disturbances that had been organised against them in their churches. Frightful scenes had already been witnessed at the Church of St. Barnabas in London, and later on in the Church of St. George. But notwithstanding such incidents, the Ritualists, strong in numbers and influence, continued their policy of introducing Catholic practices. The Catholic holidays were observed with special devotion, prayers for the dead were enjoined, the Holy Week ceremonies, and, notably, the adoration of the Cross on Good Friday, were brought in, and, to emphasise the Real Presence in the Eucharist, the Benediction service was borrowed from the Catholic Church.

To counteract this Catholicising movement, the Low Church party founded the *Church Association* in 1865,

* *Life of Manning*, Vol. II., pp. 276-88.
† Walsh, *Secret History of the Oxford Movement*, Chap. V.

and an appeal against the Ritualists was made in 1866, but the bishops, being hopelessly divided, Wilberforce of Oxford favouring the Ritualists, while Tait of London supported the Low Church, no effective help could be expected from that quarter. The opponents of the Ritualists then turned to Parliament, and in 1867 a Royal Commission was set up to institute an inquiry into the alleged infractions of the rubrics. They reported in favour of giving the parishioners who felt themselves aggrieved a cheap and convenient method of seeking redress, but Parliament showed no readiness to give legislative effect to the report. The Low Church party, despairing of getting help from the bishops or Parliament, raised large sums of money to institute proceedings in the civil courts against the Ritualist clergymen. The first and most remarkable of these was against the Rev. A. H. Mackonochie, vicar of St. Alban's, who was a man of great zeal and activity, but extreme in his Ritualist practices. The Court of Arches decided against him on many points, but refused to condemn him on others (1867); and his opponents appealed to the Privy Council, which gave a verdict in their favour (1868). But as the vicar continued the practices which had been condemned, new prosecutions were instituted against him and new condemnations were secured to the great scandal of the people. Similar scenes were witnessed in other parts of England.

For a short time the Ritualist troubles were forgotten when High Church and Low Church joined hands in defence of the Athanasian Creed. The Broad Church party, little favourable to precise dogmatic definitions, began to object to the Athanasian Creed, and the question was brought before the Royal Commission in 1870. The majority of the members of the commission refused to suppress the symbol in the Anglican services, while the minority, led by the primate, Tait, demanded that it should be omitted from the liturgy. The dispute grew warm on both sides, and the Athanasian Creed formed the main subject of discussion in the press and on the

platforms and in the pulpits for a number of years. The bishops were in a difficult position, and would probably have ended the dispute by agreeing to the suppression had not Pusey, Liddon and their friends declared that in such an event they should be obliged to resign their offices in the Anglican Church. In 1873, a formula was agreed upon which for the time being put an end to the difficulties. The bishops declared that the Athanasian Creed added nothing to the doctrine of the Scriptures, and the punishments threatened in it against unbelievers are to be understood in the same sense as the promises of reward and punishment to be found in the Bible.

In the same year a number of Ritualist clergymen presented a petition to Convocation advocating the necessity of giving the aspirants to the ministry such a training as might fit them for work in the confessional. Such a petition was sufficient to rouse the whole fighting instincts of the Low Church party. Meetings were held over the country to protest against confession. A committee of the Second House of Convocation was appointed to draft a report on the subject, and the result of their labours was published in 1873. They reported that, according to the Articles, Penance was not a Sacrament nor did the Church recognise sacramental confession, that the ordinary method by which a sinner might hope for pardon was to acknowledge and bewail his fault before God and promise amendment, that the minister had no authority to insist upon a detailed confession of sins, nor a private confession of any kind as a condition for the reception of the Eucharist, nor to enjoin habitual confession as a necessary means of advancement in the spiritual life. The Ritualists issued, as a reply to this, a counter profession of faith. In 1874, it was determined that the time had come when government should interfere and put an end to the discussion. A bill directed against the Ritualists was introduced into the House of Lords in 1874, and, notwithstanding the resolute opposition of Gladstone, it became law under the title of the Public Worship Regu-

lation Act (1874), which opened a new era of prosecutions against the Ritualists. The Lambeth Conference in 1878 failed to effect an agreement between the two parties, but in 1883, on the appointment of Dr. Benson to the see of Canterbury, a more moderate spirit began to prevail. The bishop of Lincoln was cited before his tribunal in 1888, and after Dr. Benson had consulted the Privy Council about his jurisdiction to try the case, the court was opened in February, 1889. In 1890 he gave a decision which was hailed with satisfaction by the moderate men of both parties. The case was carried before the Privy Council in 1891, and the decision of the primate was confirmed (2nd Aug., 1892). But the agreement was only a truce, and the dispute soon continued with all its bitterness. In 1906, a commission was appointed to examine into the illegal practices in some of the Anglican churches, and reported very unfavourably for the Ritualists, but for the present the government has not attempted to formulate legislation.

(*e*) The Church in Scotland

Bellesheim, *Geschichte der Katholischen Kirche in Schottland*, 2 Bde., Mayence, 1883, Vol. II., pp. 368-556. Bellesheim, *History of the Catholic Church of Scotland*, 4 vols., 1887-90. Walsh, *History of the Catholic Church in Scotland*, Glasgow, 1874, pp. 519-616. Gordon, *The Catholic Church in Scotland from the Suppression of the Hierarchy to the Present Time*, Aberdeen, 1874. Geddes, *The Position of the Scottish Catholics after Culloden*, London, 1822. Butler, *Memoirs of English, Scottish and Irish Catholics*, 2nd ed., London, 1822. *The Catholic Directory for Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1909. Forbes Leith, *Memoirs of Scottish Catholics during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, 2 vols., 1909.

In no part of the British Isles was the persecution against Catholics so severe as in Scotland. The loyalty of the Highlanders to the House of Stuart afforded a pretext that was eagerly seized upon by the Presbyterians to urge on the extirpation of Catholicity. After the defeat of Prince Charles Edward at Culloden, the last hope of the Catholics seemed to have been extinguished, and, owing to the number of those who fell

in battle, fled into exile, or were arrested and sent into foreign service, the Catholic population of Scotland was largely reduced. The total number of Catholics in the country was reckoned as about 18,000, practically all of whom were resident in the Highlands. Their spiritual wants were attended to by two vicars apostolic, who were generally assisted by coadjutors, and by about forty priests, nearly half of whom belonged to the Society of Jesus. Nor were there wanting, even in the most gloomy days of the persecutions, divisions and grave contentions between the vicars and the regular clergy.

The defeat of the Pretender at Culloden was the occasion of the conversion of George Hay, who was such a distinguished ornament of the Catholic Church in Scotland during the latter half of the eighteenth century. He was a medical student at Edinburgh, who, having joined the banner of Prince Charles Edward, was arrested and sent to London, where he made the acquaintance of Catholics, and acquired some knowledge of Catholic doctrine. He was received into the Catholic Church at Edinburgh in 1748, and having finished his medical studies went as doctor on board a ship. Believing that he was called to be a priest, he went to Rome, where he was ordained in 1758, and returned immediately to labour on the mission in Scotland. Here he was so remarkable for his zeal and ability that he was selected as coadjutor to Dr. Grant, and was consecrated bishop in 1769. Besides his activity in the work of the missions, Dr. Hay did good service as a writer to the Catholic cause in Scotland. In 1776, he published an English translation of the Bible, and in the same year his work on *Miracles* appeared, and attracted the favourable notice of his countrymen, both Catholic and Presbyterian. Besides these he brought out in five volumes his well-known works, *The Sincere Christian, The Devout Christian*, and *The Pious Christian*.

He did good work also in exposing the frightful treatment meted out to the Catholic Highlanders by some of the lords, and when the idea of a Relief Bill for English Catholics began to be mooted he made strenuous efforts

to secure that its provision should also be extended to Scotland. But religious bigotry was still too strong in that country to permit the passage of such a measure. A wild agitation against the Relief Bill broke out in Scotland. The General Assembly petitioned against the bill, and appointed a committee to oppose it; the Glasgow Synod proclaimed a fast, and the preachers lashed the populace to fury by their extravagant denunciations of Popery (1778). The houses where Mass was celebrated in Glasgow were wrecked, and the house of bishop Hay, together with those of prominent Catholic citizens of Edinburgh, was burned to the ground under the very eyes of the city magistrates. Dr. Hay issued a pastoral to console and encourage his flock, and set out for London to seek compensation for the losses that had been inflicted upon Catholics during the disturbances. Here he was well received by prominent members of both parties. Edmund Burke presented the petition of the Scotch Catholics for relief and for compensation to the House of Commons, but owing to the strong opposition the government refused to extend the Relief Bill to Scotland (1779). A sum of £1,600 was voted as compensation for the losses of the Catholics in Edinburgh and Glasgow.

It was only in 1793 that the First Relief Bill for the Catholics of Scotland could be passed. It abolished the penalties prescribed for Roman Catholics by the Act passed in the first year of the reign of William III., and permitted them to hold and bequeath property, but many of the disabilities were left untouched. Still, small as the concessions were, they, at least, allowed the Catholics to practise their religion openly without danger of persecution.

The education of priests for the Scotch mission, and the difficulties with some of the regular clergy, were a source of grave trouble to the vicars apostolic. The Scotch College at Douay had been placed in the hands of the Jesuit Fathers, and on the suppression of the society in France (1762) the college was seized by the

government. But owing mainly to the exertions of Dr. Hay it was restored to Scotch secular priests, and a royal patent of 1780 guaranteed them possession of the property acquired by the college before 1749. The storm of the revolution soon burst over Douay, and the Scotch College was disbanded. Besides Douay, the Scotch had colleges in Rome and in Paris, but the Roman College, having been placed in the hands of Italian officials after the suppression of the Society of Jesus, was practically useless, as the vicars pointed out in their reports to Propaganda, while the College in Paris, partly through the spirit of Jansenism that had settled there, partly on account of the complete independence claimed by its rector, was rather a source of scandal than of strength. During the revolution the position of the colleges in Rome and Paris was seriously affected, and no help could be expected from them, while the old Irish foundation in Regensburg secured by the Scotch had long ceased to do any practical work for Scotland. The Scotch College at Valladolid, given for the use of the Scotch students by Charles III. of Spain, on the suppression of the Jesuits at Madrid, still remained, but its existence was very precarious. Hence, it became necessary for the vicars in Scotland to provide means of educating candidates for the priesthood in the country itself. A small seminary had been founded at Scalan by Dr. Gordon (1706-1746), and had been availed of largely for the preparatory training of the clerical students. But in 1799 a new college was founded by Dr. Hay at Aquhorties in Aberdeen, and the students from Scalan were transferred to the new foundation. Besides Scalan, a small seminary had been opened at Samlaman mainly for the benefit of the Highland mission, but it was replaced in 1799 by the seminary at Lismore. Most of the Catholics in Scotland were poor, and though willing to contribute to the support of their religion they were unable to give much financial assistance. Some of the old endowments remained, and were invested in France and in Rome, but they, too, were

involved in the ruin wrought by the Revolution. The little assistance contributed by the Propaganda was insufficient and uncertain, and hence the vicars appealed to the government for help. They were justified in hoping for some compensation for the losses that had been inflicted upon them by France owing to the English war, and were it not for the danger of arousing another storm of bigotry, the government was anxious to comply with their reasonable demands. A little help was given for the support of the vicars, their coadjutors, and their clergy, and for the erection and maintenance of ecclesiastical seminaries at Aquhorties and Lismore. The annual grant was discontinued after three years.

In the year 1800, it is estimated that there were about 30,000 Catholics in Scotland, attended by about forty priests, and governed by two vicars. The number of Catholic chapels was about twelve. Owing to the persecution carried on by some of the Highland lairds against the Catholics great numbers of them emigrated to Canada, where they settled in little colonies, and where their descendants retain the faith till the present day. Others settled in Glasgow and in the Lowland districts. According to a report of Dr. Hay to the Propaganda in 1804, there were then twenty-eight priests in his district, all seculars, in charge of separate missions, and dependent upon the vicar for faculties and means of support. A grant of ten pounds a year was made to them by the vicar. They were all men of good lives and great zeal in preaching the gospel, while the Catholic laity kept aloof from all heretical services, though some of them married non-Catholic wives, but as a rule the marriage was contracted in the presence of the Catholic clergyman. After 1805 Dr. Hay retired to the seminary of Aquhorties, leaving the work to his coadjutor, Dr. Cameron. There he died in 1811, being then eighty-three years of age.

Between the years 1800 and 1829 the number of Catholics in the Lowland districts rapidly increased. This was due in part to the immigration from Ireland,

and in part to the settlement of great numbers of the Highlanders in the industrial districts of the south. They settled mainly in Edinburgh, Glasgow, Aberdeen, Dundee, Dumfries and Perth, and a great number of Catholic churches were erected and new missions opened. But nowhere was the increase in the Catholic population so remarkable as in Glasgow. In 1778, there were only about forty Catholics in Glasgow. After the destruction of their little chapel in 1779, and the attack made in the same year on the house of Mr. Bagenal, where Mass used to be celebrated, they assembled for divine worship in a small upper room opposite Bridgegate. In 1791, the Tennis Court in Mitchell Street was fitted up as a temporary church, and in 1797, a small church was erected beside the military barracks. As the number of Catholics rapidly increased, more accommodation was required, and Father Scott, who took charge of the Glasgow district in 1805, undertook the erection of St. Andrew's Church in Great Clyde Street. The spaciousness and magnificence of this building excited the envy of some of the more rabid non-Catholics, and bitter attacks on the zealous pastor were published in one of the local papers. He was charged with having wrung money from starving Catholics by threatening them with a refusal of the sacraments in case they neglected to contribute to the building funds. An action for libel was instituted by him against the writers and printers, and the jury having returned a verdict in his favour, he was awarded substantial damages and costs. This victory in the courts was important, as it raised the spirits of the Catholics and taught themselves and their opponents that the days of persecution were at length passed. The untiring energy of Father Scott was rewarded by the rapid increase in the Catholic population of Glasgow. In 1827 the total number of Catholics in Scotland had risen to about 70,000, of whom nearly 20,000 were in Glasgow and the adjoining district. On account of this rapid growth Leo XIII., by the brief, *Quanta Laetitia*, made a new division of Scotland by creating three vicariates,

namely, one for the Northern district, one for the Western, and one for the Southern (1827).

When it was rumoured that the government had given way to the agitation of O'Connell and the Catholic Association, and that Sir Robert Peel intended to introduce an Emancipation Bill, the old scenes of anti-Catholic bigotry were witnessed in Scotland. Meetings were held to denounce the proposed measure, and petitions against it were sent from many districts, notably from Edinburgh and Glasgow. But, on the other hand, many of the leading men of Scotland, such as Sir William Arbuthnot, Sir Walter Scott, Sir James Moncrieff, Lord Cockburn and Dr. Chalmers, strongly advocated emancipation. Though the Act of 1829 removed most of the glaring legal disabilities of the Catholic body, it fell far short, especially in Scotland, of putting them in a position of exact equality with their Protestant fellow-citizens. The Scotch Catholics were still obliged to pay the Annuity-Tax for the support of the Presbyterian worship; the proclamation of the marriage banns had still to be made by the ministers of the state church; the educational grievances of the Catholics received no redress, while in the public institutions of the country, the prisons, hospitals and homes for the poor, no provision was made for the appointment of Catholic chaplains.

But with all its deficiencies, the Emancipation Act of 1829 infused a new life into the Catholics of Scotland. Churches and schools were multiplied in the great centres of population and in the outlying districts; the number of the clergy rapidly increased, and their conduct during the great cholera plague of 1832 won the admiration and respect of the whole Protestant community. A generous Catholic, Mr. John Menzies, handed over his residence and demesne at Blairs to the vicars apostolic, and it was determined to abandon the old seminaries at Aquhorties and Lismore, and establish there one seminary for Scotland (1829). The colleges at Douay and Paris were not re-established after the

Restoration, but the French government undertook to defray the expenses of eighteen students to be educated in French seminaries for the Scotch mission. Attempts were made by Dr. Gillis to secure the conversion of the foundation at Regensburg into a seminary for Scotch students, but the negotiations with the Bavarian government broke down. In 1862, however, an agreement was arrived at, according to which the government of Bavaria agreed to pay a certain amount of compensation, which the vicars applied to the erection of a new Scotch College in Rome. In 1836, a convent of Ursuline Nuns was opened in Edinburgh, owing in great measure to the generosity of the Bourbon family in France, and this was the first convent founded in Scotland since the suppression of the religious houses during the Reformation.

Owing largely to the great stream of immigration from Ireland the Catholic population rapidly increased between 1829 and 1860, and nowhere was the increase so marked as in Glasgow. While Dr. Scott was vicar of the Western district (1828-1846) everything went well, but after his death ugly disputes broke out amongst the Catholic body in Glasgow, and disturbed the peace of the community for years. The clergy and the Catholic body then in Glasgow were composed of two widely different elements, the native Scotch who had remained faithful to their religion, and the Catholic immigrants from Ireland. In the circumstances a certain amount of jealousy between these parties was unavoidable, and did not necessarily imply any serious fault on either side. The Irish portion of the community considered that in his appointments to missions Dr. Murdoch, the vicar of the Western district (1847-1866) favoured his own countrymen, and their alleged grievances found their way into the columns of one of the Glasgow newspapers. The complaints were carried to Rome, where Dr. Murdoch defended himself energetically against the charges that had been made. While the dispute was yet warm he died in 1866, and the Propaganda hoped to

settle the dispute by appointing Dr. Lynch, an Irish Vincentian, coadjutor to Dr. Gray, the new vicar apostolic of the Western district.

But the hopes of the Propaganda were doomed to disappointment, and as the division between the two parties continued to increase, Dr. Manning, archbishop of Westminster, was requested to make an apostolic visitation of the district, and to furnish a report to Rome (1867). Acting on these instructions, Dr. Manning visited the district, and inquired into the grievances of both parties, and as a result of his reports Dr. Gray resigned the vicarship of the Western district, and Dr. Lynch was appointed coadjutor bishop of Kildare and Leighlin. But it was a matter of some difficulty to find a successor to Dr. Gray who might be acceptable to both parties, and who, by being aloof from both, might put an end to the unfortunate dissensions. Dr. Errington, the former coadjutor to Cardinal Wiseman, refused to accept the responsible task, and, on his refusal, Dr. Eyre, Vicar General of Hexham and Newcastle, was appointed. He was consecrated at Rome in 1868, and had the good fortune of seeing the divisions between the two parties of his clergy and flock completely healed.

These controversies, however unfortunate in themselves, were the means of doing good by bringing to the front the question of dividing Scotland into dioceses and re-establishing a canonical hierarchy. Some of those who opposed the vicars maintained that this was the only method of restoring peace to the Church. Dr. Manning was asked to express his views on this subject, and in a report sent to the Propaganda in 1864 he strongly recommended the appointment of regular bishops, while, on the other hand, the three vicars, Drs. Murdoch, Kyle and Gray, objected to such a step as being more likely to be productive of evil rather than good. Dr. Eyre was sent into Scotland as Apostolic delegate in order to prepare the way for such a measure, and in 1877, on the occasion of the golden jubilee of the episcopate of Pius IX., Dr. Strain, vicar of the Eastern

district, accompanied by a deputation of clergy and laymen, presented the congratulations of the Scotch Catholics to His Holiness, and begged him to do for Scotland what he had already done for England, namely, to re-establish the hierarchy.

The question was taken up warmly by the Propaganda, with the assistance and advice of Dr. Manning, Dr. Strain and Dr. Eyre. The difficulties against such a measure had been clearly put by Dr. Kyle, the vicar of the Northern district (1828-1869), and were well met by the supporters of the project. On questions of detail some difficulties arose, notably in connection with the selection of the metropolitan see. Edinburgh naturally claimed the honour, not alone as the old see of St. Andrew's but also as the civil and literary capital of the country, while, in support of the claims of Glasgow it was urged that it was the great industrial centre, and had the largest Catholic population. In the end, the difficulty was solved by creating both Edinburgh and Glasgow archiepiscopal sees, Edinburgh having precedence, and having under it a number of suffragan dioceses, while Glasgow was independent and had no suffragan sees. Difficulties also arose about the erection of cathedral chapters and the method of electing bishops, but these were put aside for the time being. The negotiations were not completed when Pius IX. died, and it was left to his successor, Leo XIII., to publish the brief, *Ex supremo Apostolatus Apice,* by which the hierarchy was re-established in Scotland (4th March, 1878).

According to this brief the metropolitan see of St. Andrew's was erected at Edinburgh with the four suffragan dioceses, Aberdeen, Dunkeld, Galloway and Argyle and the Isles, while Glasgow was created an archbishopric. All the rights and privileges of bishops were granted to the occupants of these sees, and all the old special customs and exemptions were abolished. At the same time the Pope filled the newly created sees, Dr. Strain, Vicar Apostolic of the Eastern district being appointed to St. Andrew's, and Dr. Eyre, of the Wes-

tern district, to Glasgow. The re-establishment of the hierarchy in Scotland did not raise a storm similar to that created in England in 1850. Most of the journals, while unsympathetic, were just enough not to misrepresent the measure; and the only protest worth noting came from the remnants of the episcopal church, which James I. and Charles II. tried to force upon Scotland, and which at this time claimed to be the only true representative of the ancient church.

The Catholic population of Scotland had increased enormously since 1829. In 1874, there were 360,000 Catholics in the country, with 227 priests, 232 churches or chapels, 23 convents, an ecclesiastical seminary, St. Mary's College, Blairs, and a college in Spain in addition to provision for students in France on the old Douay and Paris foundations. Among the religious orders of men that had been introduced into the country were the Jesuits, the Oblates, the Vincentians, the Redemptorists, the Passionists, and the Franciscans, while different communities of nuns were invited to undertake the direction of primary schools, secondary schools, reformatories, and homes for the old and infirm.

In 1881, Leo XIII. showed his interest in the Scotch Church by issuing a constitution, fixing the relations between the regular clergy, who were engaged on pastoral work and the bishops. Such men were to have the same privileges as they should be entitled to in houses of their order, but in the care of souls and in the administration of the Sacraments they were subject to the bishop, and were obliged to attend the theological conferences and diocesan synods in the same way as the secular clergy. The bishop had the same power of dividing their parishes as the other parishes of his diocese, and the right of inspecting their primary schools; and regulars so engaged in parochial works were obliged to give him an account of the mission funds.

The total Catholic population of Scotland at present is over 518,625, the religious wants of which are pro-

vided for by 459 secular priests and 95 regulars. For the education of the clergy there are two colleges, St. Mary's College, Blairs, founded in 1829, and St. Peter's, Glasgow, founded in 1874. In addition to these there is a Scotch College in Rome and another at Valladolid. The old Scotch College in Paris is not occupied by the students, but the funds are devoted to the education of a certain number of students at St. Sulpice. Catholic secondary education is provided for by colleges conducted for the most part by members of religious congregations, while the system of primary schools approved for Scotland leaves the Catholics almost complete freedom regarding religious education. In 1907, there were 213 Catholic primary schools with accommodation for 100,454 pupils and an average attendance of 85,255.* The total amount of assistance paid from public sources to these schools amounted to £190,965.

* *Return*, 1908, p. 143.

CHAPTER II

THE CHURCH IN IRELAND

(*a*) The Repeal of the Penal Laws

Moran, *Spicilegium Ossoriense: A Collection of Original Letters and Papers Illustrative of the History of the Catholic Church in Ireland from the Reformation till* 1800, 3 vols., Dublin, 1874. *Irish Statutes*, 1750-1800. Hardy, *Life of Charlemont*, 2 vols., London, 1812. Grattan, *Life and Times of Henry Grattan*, 5 vols., London, 1839-1846. Flood, *Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of Flood*, 2 vols., Dublin, 1838. *Works and Correspondence of Edmund Burke*, 8 vols., London, 1851. *Memoirs of Theobald Wolfe Tone*, 2 vols., London, 1827. *Memoirs and Correspondence of Castlereagh*, 8 vols., London, 1848-51. *Correspondence of Cornwallis*, 3 vols., London, 1859. Curry, *An Historical and Critical Review of the Civil Wars in Ireland*, 2 vols., London, 1786. Madden, *Historical Notice of the Penal Laws against Roman Catholics*, London, 1865. Parnell, *History of the Penal Laws*, Dublin, 1808. O'Connor, M., *History of the Irish Catholics*, Dublin, 1813. Wyse, *Historical Sketch of the late Catholic Association in Ireland*, 2 vols., London, 1829. Plowden, *An Historical Survey of the State of Ireland from Henry II. to the Union*, 2 vols., London, 1803. Butler, *Historical Memoirs of English, Irish and Scottish Catholics*, 2nd ed., London, 1822. Lecky, *History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, 5 vols., 1892. *D'Alton's History of Ireland*, Vol. II., London, 1906. Bellesheim, *Geschichte der Katholischen Kirche in Irland*, 3 Bde., Mayence, 1901. Renehan and MacCarthy, *Collections of Irish Church History*, Dublin, 1861. Brenan, *The Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, Dublin, 1864. Moran, *The Catholics of Ireland under the Penal Laws in the Eighteenth Century*, London, 1900.

The reign of George III. (1760-1820) witnessed a great change in the position of the Irish Catholics. The penal laws, which had been enforced strictly till that period, were to a great extent removed, and the Catholics, who formed the great bulk of the population, began to acquire a voice in the public affairs of the country proportionate

to their numbers, wealth and education. Many influences were at work in preparing the way for a repeal of the penal laws. After the unsuccessful attempt of Charles Edward, the young Pretender, in 1745, the government anticipated no danger from the representatives of the Stuarts. Though the Irish Catholics had taken no part in the rising of 1745, their sympathies were still supposed to be with the exiled royal family, and their want of loyalty to the House of Hanover was put forward as a sufficient barrier against any relaxation of the penal code. But in the changed circumstances of the times, when the reports from their spies had made it clear to the authorities that no danger was to be apprehended from the "Pretenders," it was felt that the charge of disloyalty could be exploited no longer in justification of the persecution of the Catholics of Ireland.

On the contrary, it was felt that unless something was done to improve their condition, Ireland might prove a source of real danger to England during the Continental wars in which that country was involved. So long as the great body of the people in Ireland were treated as outlaws in their own country it was felt that they might be utilised by France to create embarrassments for England; and that, if a French force were to succeed in effecting a landing in Ireland, the Catholics might rally to their support, set up a government of their own, and place themselves under the protection of France. The Irish brigades on the Continent had shown at Fontenoy (1745) and elsewhere that, under capable leaders, they were a dangerous power. Might it not be reasonably expected that, did the opportunity arise, they would show themselves not less capable in defence of their own country and religion, and that from their own countrymen and co-religionists they would receive sympathy and earnest support?

Besides, the permanent enslavement of three-fourths of the population of a country and their exclusion from every position of trust or emolument, was certain to

prove disastrous even for the interests of the favoured one-fourth. In Ireland the penal laws had operated seriously to the detriment of the army, navy, agriculture, trade and commerce of the country. England required marines and soldiers to fight her battles against France, Austria and Spain. Yet, owing to the legislation against the Catholics, the class of men which had supplied such valuable recruits for the armies of France, Austria, Spain, and Naples, could not be accepted by the recruiting officers in Ireland. This was felt to be a mistake, and in 1759 a motion was made in the Irish House of Commons to permit the enlistment of Catholic regiments for service in Portugal, but the opposition was so strong that the Chief Secretary, Hamilton, was obliged to give way, and procure by secret instructions to the recruiting agents what he could not carry by legislation in the House of Commons. The opponents of the measure justified their action by the fact that it was dangerous to place weapons in the hands of men who might use them to overthrow the Protestant government of the country, and that, besides, the removal of so many able-bodied young men from the South and West of Ireland was calculated to derange the labour market in these districts.

Again, the operation of the penal laws prevented the Catholics from investing their money in land. So long as they could secure no legal tenure they preferred to turn their energies to trade and commerce. Many of them had, as merchants, amassed large fortunes which were not infrequently invested in foreign securities. On the other hand, the Protestant landlords, the English and Scotch planters and undertakers, having acquired their property on such easy terms, lived riotously and were in need of raising money by the sale or mortgage of their property. Much as these men hated and despised the Catholics, yet Catholic money was as good for them as that of Protestants; and, hence, they were anxious to secure a repeal of the enactments which prevented the Irish Catholics from investing their money

in Irish land. The action of the Irish landlords, who formed the great body of the legislature of the country, was dictated by no generous sentiment of toleration, but by pure self-interest, and Catholics have no reason to be grateful to them for the repeal of the laws which prevented their body from securing legal tenure of land in this country.

A great change, too, had come over the world towards the end of the eighteenth century. The spread of rationalistic principles blunted the religious feelings of the people both in Catholic and Protestant centres, and softened the bigotry that had been stirred up by the religious wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The American War of Independence and the outbreak of the French Revolution helped to popularise new ideas of liberty and toleration. In the light of such events many of the ascendency class in Ireland began to feel ashamed of the treatment which they had meted out for centuries to the great body of the population, and others of them, fearing that with the spread of democratic ideas, the Catholics would insist upon equality, thought it was more prudent to forestall the crisis by some half-way concessions. The earlier Irish "patriots," men like Swift and Lucas, stood up for the rights of Ireland against England, but the Ireland of their conception was a nation in which the Protestant classes should be the rulers, and the Catholics, slaves deprived of every civil right. Even in later days, such liberal-minded statesmen as Flood, Charlemont, Foster, the Speaker of the Irish House of Commons, Caldwell, Newenham, and Sir John Parnell (in 1791), strongly opposed the idea of Catholic emancipation, though they were anxious to secure a relaxation of the penal laws. They fought for Parliamentary reform, but their idea of a reformed Irish Parliament was one from which the representatives of three-fourths of the population should be excluded merely on religious grounds. There were, however, others who adopted a more liberal view. Edmund Burke (1729-97), himself an Irishman, and the

husband of an Irish Catholic lady, sympathised with his Catholic countrymen, and advocated their cause in England with all the vigour and eloquence which he could command. From 1765, when he published the *Tracts on the Popery Laws*, till his death, he laboured incessantly in the Catholic cause, partly through sympathy with the oppressed, and partly through a desire of securing the alliance of the Catholics in the struggle against the dangerous principles propagated throughout Europe by the French Revolution. Closely associated with Burke in this campaign in favour of the Irish Catholics was Henry Grattan (1746-1820), the most noble-minded of the Irish Parliamentarians. From his entry into public life till the day of his death he upheld the principle that the Irish Protestants could never be free till the Catholics had ceased to be slaves. He fought for the independence of Ireland, but the Ireland of Grattan's dreams was an Ireland where both Catholics and Protestants should enjoy equal rights and equal protection. It is largely to the personal influence of these two men, Burke and Grattan, that the change of feeling on the Catholic question in the last quarter of the eighteenth century is to be attributed.

A great change, too, was noticeable in the attitude of the Irish Catholics themselves. In 1757, when the first Catholic Committee made an effort to bring about some amelioration of their condition, the Catholics of Ireland were for the most part a nation of slaves. The penal laws had succeeded in quenching the spirit of independence and of equality, and in reducing the Catholics to such a state of servility that they regarded themselves as an inferior race, happy in being permitted to live in their own land. The few noblemen, whose property was left untouched by the general or particular measures of confiscation, lived apart, despised by their own equals, and distrustful even of the masses of their own co-religionists. They had suffered much rather than desert their religion, but being perfectly acquainted with the strength and spirit of the ascendency party, they could see no hope for

redress except in throwing themselves as humble petitioners at the feet of the English or Irish ministers. A direct appeal to the people was put aside by them as both useless and dangerous. The clergy, educated for the most part on the Continent, where submission to absolute government was pushed to extremes, and inured to hardships at home, naturally sympathised with the classes from which they were sprung, and to whom they ministered at such risks, but they feared that any combined efforts for redress would only supply a weapon of attack to the bigoted section of their rulers, and lead to a new and more violent persecution. The vast body of the people, the small farmers and the labourers were entirely dependent upon the Protestant landowners. Deprived of votes at the Parliamentary elections, and of every means of making their grievances felt in an effective manner, they were powerless, and had not yet realised the strength which numbers alone can give.

It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that the Catholics of Ireland at this period were a completely impoverished class. Many of the Catholic merchants in Dublin and in the provincial cities and towns had, as merchants, amassed immense wealth. Others, having adopted the medical profession, from which they were not excluded by law or custom, and having secured a degree in Paris or elsewhere, returned to Ireland and laboured amongst their own countrymen. These men were brought into touch with the educational centres of the Continent, and with the Catholic merchants in France and Spain. They saw the splendour of the Catholic religion in these countries, and by comparison they realised the degradation of their co-religionists at home. They imbibed something of the democratic spirit that was then beginning to stir the masses on the Continent, and they began to appreciate the change that might be effected if only a little life and spirit could be infused into the masses of the Irish Catholics. Like the *bourgeoisie* in France they turned to the people for support, but the spirit of the people was so crushed by years of persecu-

tion that they required years of patient education before they understood their strength.*

The Duke of Bedford, who was supposed to be rather friendly to the Catholics, arrived as Lord Lieutenant in 1757. Soon, however, a new measure directed against the clergy, and more especially the bishops, was introduced by Lord Clanbrassil, and would have become law had not the English authorities used their influence against it. During the discussion of this bill in 1756 and in 1757 the Irish Catholics began to show signs of life. Their principal leaders at this period were Dr. John Curry, a distinguished Catholic physician and the author of several able works on Irish history, Mr. Wyse, a gentleman of Waterford, Charles O'Connor (1710-1791),† the distinguished Irish scholar and antiquary of Belnagare, Lord Trimleston and Viscount Taafe. At a meeting held at the house of Lord Trimleston a declaration of Catholic principles, drawn up by Dr. O'Keefe, the bishop of Kildare, as a reply to the various calumnies brought forward against their body, was adopted and published. Soon, however, dissension began to break out between the different sections of the Catholic party. The mercantile section wished to address the government for some relaxation of the penal code, while the gentry and clergy doubted the prudence of such a step at that particular juncture.‡ In 1759, when it was feared that the French were about to invade Ireland, the Catholic leaders met to draw up an address of loyalty, and, after prolonged discussions, the document was drawn, signed by 400 Catholic gentlemen, and handed to Mr. Ponsonby, the Speaker of the House of Commons, to be presented to the Lord Lieutenant. A reply to this was inserted in the *Dublin Gazette,* in which the Catholics were assured "that so long as they conducted themselves with duty and affection, they could not fail to receive his Majesty's protection." This was the first

* Wyse, Vol. I., pp. 49-61.

† *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the late Charles O'Connor of Belnagare,* 1796.

‡ *History of the Irish Catholics,* pp. 245-49.

official recognition of the Catholic body since the accession of the House of Hanover, and it seems to have been regarded by them as an event of prime importance. Their expressions of loyalty and gratitude on the occasion afford sufficient proof of the state of degradation to which they had been reduced.*

In 1760, at a meeting held in the Elephant Tavern, Essex Street, Mr. Wyse submitted a scheme for the organisation of a permanent Catholic Committee, composed of the clergy, nobility, and representatives of the people.† It was adopted with some alterations, but from the very beginning the dissensions between the gentry and the middle classes threatened the existence of the body, and paralysed its efforts for redress. On the accession of George III. the General Committee of the Catholics drew up an address to His Majesty which bore the signature of 600 Catholics. The Catholic gentry held a separate meeting at Trim, and presented an address from their own body, while the bishops, unwilling to antagonise either section, held aloof from both. The addresses from the two bodies were graciously received and acknowledged. The Catholic Committee, urged on by Viscount Taafe, determined to present a remonstrance, setting forth the disabilities under which their co-religionists laboured, and requesting some relief, but the opposition of Lord Trimleston and his colleagues destroyed the success of the project. A series of ugly disputes continued to distract the Catholic Committee during the years 1761 and 1762, and though an apparent reconciliation was effected, the committee practically ceased to exist in 1763.‡ Such a result cannot be wondered at by anybody acquainted with the circumstances of the period, nor should either party be blamed too severely on account of the dissensions that arose. Both sections were equally interested in securing a repeal of the penal laws, but they differed in regard to the best

* Address given in Parnell's *Penal Laws*, pp. 84-5.
† *History of Irish Catholics*, pp. 260-61.
‡ *Idem.*, pp. 269 *sqq.*

means of arriving at such a result. One party feared to arouse new persecution by an attitude of boldness or independence, the other thought that it was only by plain speaking that the masses of their co-religionists could be aroused, and the success of their cause ensured.

In 1762, Lord Trimleston presented a petition requesting that Catholics should be allowed to serve in the army, but though the petition was supported by the Lord Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary, it was rejected as dangerous and inexpedient. So early as 1761 a bill permitting Catholics to lend money on landed security was carried by a ruse in the Irish House of Commons, but was set aside by the English Privy Council. The same bill, however, on being re-introduced during the next session of Parliament, was thrown out twice by a large majority on the ground that it was dangerous to Protestant interests in this country.* In addition to their other grievances, the Catholics of the cities and corporate towns were obliged to pay the iniquitous tax, known as Quarterage, levied by the corporations and guilds in order to provide "regalia, ensigns and colours for the different fraternities, to support freemen, to bury the dead, to wait on the mayor on days of solemnity, and to provide anniversary entertainments." Such a contribution for such purposes was deemed an intolerable grievance, and during the earlier years of the reign of George III., when the Catholics were assured of some measure of legal protection, they successfully contested the legality of the levy in the law courts. Petitions immediately began to pour in against such insolence from the corporate cities of Dublin, Cork, Drogheda, Limerick, Waterford, Wexford, &c. A bill was introduced in 1767 to legalise the levy, but the Catholics raised funds, employed lawyers to defend their interests before the Privy Council, and, mainly owing to the friendly attitude of Lord Townshend, the Lord Lieutenant, the bill was quashed.†

* Lecky, Vol. II., p. 191.
† *History of Irish Catholics*, pp. 329-33.

In 1771, an Act was passed permitting Catholics to take leases for sixty-one years of fifty acres of bog, with an additional half acre of arable land as a site for their houses. But it was stipulated that the bog should be at least four feet deep, that it should not be situated within a mile of any city or market town, and that half of it should be reclaimed within a period of twenty-one years. On these conditions it was agreed that for seven years after the bog was reclaimed the land should be exempt from tithes and cesses.* The bill allowing the Catholics to lend money on landed security was, however, rejected in the same year, and on its re-introduction in 1774 passed only the preliminary stages. But in this year an Act was passed "to enable his Majesty's subjects of whatsoever persuasion to testify their allegiance to him." It permitted the Catholics to testify their loyalty by taking an oath of loyalty to the House of Hanover, and by rejecting the doctrine that the Pope could depose princes or exercise any civil authority in these realms.† The oath was a curious document, and though doctrinally not incorrect was very offensive in its tone. It afforded new grounds for dissension among the Catholic body,‡ but the vast majority, both clerics and laymen, agreed that it might be taken without any violence to Catholic teaching.

The first Catholic Committee had been almost entirely dissolved by the disputes between the rival sections in 1762 and 1763, but it had set the example, and had shown that much might be accomplished if only the Catholic body was aroused and united. In 1773, a second Catholic Committee was established in Dublin, under the presidency of Lord Kenmare. Petitions for redress of their main grievances were drawn up and presented to the government in 1774, 1777, and 1778. The petition of 1777 dealt largely with the question of land tenure, and showed how, even at that period, the few

* 11 & 12 Geo. III., Chap. 21.
† 13 & 14 Geo. III., Chap. 35.
‡ England, *Life of Father O'Leary*, pp. 52-79.

Catholic landowners were at the mercy of their eldest sons who might wish to embrace the established religion, and that the profession of informers in Ireland was still regarded as both honourable and lucrative.* The circumstances of the time made it necessary to pay some attention to their petitions. The American War of Independence was making heavy demands upon the resources of England, while the sympathies of the Presbyterians in the North of Ireland were supposed to be on the side of the rebellious colonies. It was feared that if in the threatened war with France another attempt might be made to invade Ireland, and if something were not done to conciliate the Catholics the French invading army would be almost certain to receive their support. Besides, the introduction of a Relief Bill for the English Catholics in May, 1778, made it absolutely necessary for the Irish government to support some similar concessions in Ireland. A Relief Bill was brought forward by Mr. Gardiner in 1778, and after considerable discussion it was accepted by the House of Commons and by the House of Lords.†

It permitted Catholics who had taken the oath of allegiance prescribed in 1774 to hold leases of land for 999 years, and to inherit and bequeath their property in the same manner as Protestants. But, at the same time, they were prevented from becoming owners of freehold property. The inducements formerly held out to the eldest sons to conform were abandoned, and the property of those who refused to conform was no longer subject to compulsory division. Edmund Burke warmly supported this measure of redress, as did also most of the independent party in the Irish House of Commons.

The Irish Parliament of this period was only the shadow of a legislative assembly. Its acts were entirely controlled by the Lord Lieutenant and the English Privy Council. None of the great safeguards of the constitution, which were in existence already in England,

* Curry, *State of the Catholics of Ireland*, Vol. II., pp. 287-93.
† 17 & 18 Geo. III., Chap. 49.

had been introduced into Ireland. The *Habeas Corpus* Act, protecting individuals against arbitrary arrest, the Triennial or Septennial Act, limiting the duration of Parliaments, the Bill of Rights, which took away from the king the right of dispensation, the Mutiny Bill, which brought the army under Parliamentary control, had no force in Ireland. The administration packed the House of Commons with its pensioned placemen; the judges being liable to dismissal from office were at the beck of the government, and the English Privy Council controlled the financial affairs of the country.

It was against such a state of things that the Opposition, led by Grattan and Flood, struggled at this period. So long as England controlled the Irish Parliament by means of the Privy Council and the placemen there was little hope for substantial reform. It was only by rousing the country and securing its united support that the Opposition could hope for success; and the opportunity for an appeal to the country came with the outbreak of the American war. The troops stationed in Ireland were required for foreign service; the country was threatened with a French invasion, and it became necessary to organise a volunteer army. From the beginning the leaders of the Opposition were clearly identified with this force, many of them, such as Grattan, Flood, Charlemont, and the Duke of Leinster having been selected as volunteer officers. Backed by an army, which in the year 1781 amounted to 100,000 men, the Opposition was enabled to carry the resolutions on Free Trade. The Convention of the Volunteers, held at Dungannon in February, 1782, stood strongly for the independence of the Irish Parliament. Grattan's address, declaring that the King, Lords and Commons of Ireland could alone legislate for Ireland, was carried unanimously in April, 1782, and the government was obliged to capitulate.

The Catholics of Ireland had been the consistent supporters of the Opposition in all their demands. They, too, had much to gain by the concession of free trade, and they hoped that in an independent Parliament their

complete emancipation might be readily secured. Though the Catholics were excluded from the Volunteers they raised large sums of money in order to procure arms and equipment for the newly organised regiments.* The assistance of the Catholics was warmly welcomed by the leaders of the Opposition, but it would be a mistake to suppose that these same leaders were unanimous in supporting Catholic emancipation. Grattan had, indeed, realised that until the penal laws were completely removed Ireland could never hope to be a really independent nation. Not so, however, Charlemont and Flood. They were not unwilling to grant them further concessions in regard to property, but they were determined to exclude them from all political influence in the country. The attitude of Charlemont when Gardiner's Relief Bill was introduced into the House of Commons showed clearly how much he distrusted the wisdom of making many concessions to the Catholics of Ireland.† When in February, 1782, Grattan, Flood, and Charlemont met at Charlemont House to draw up the resolutions to be submitted to the celebrated Dungannon Convention of Volunteers, Flood and Charlemont opposed the insertion of any resolution favourable to the Catholics. It was only when the conference was closed, and when Grattan realised how complete silence on the Catholic question might alienate their strongest supporters, that he hastily drew up the clause rejoicing at the relaxation of the penal laws against the Roman Catholic subjects.‡ In this form the resolution was passed at the Dungannon Convention, but if it be remembered how worthless were the concessions that had been made, and that all hint regarding future concessions was suppressed, the practical value of the Dungannon resolution can be more justly appreciated. Still, even in its weak form, it showed that the spirit of intolerance was slowly passing away.

It was soon found that an independent Parliament was

* *Grattan's Memoirs*, Vol. I., p. 343.
† *Memoirs and Correspondence of Flood*, Vol. I., p. 147.
‡ *Grattan's Memoirs*, Vol. II., p. 205.

of little avail so long as the basis of representation continued as it was. The Catholics, who formed three-fourths of the population, had no voice in the deliberations of the assembly or in the selection of the members to whom their fortunes were to be entrusted. Out of the 300 members of the Irish House of Commons, only 64 were returned by the counties, 14 by the cities, 2 by the University of Dublin, and 220 by the boroughs. In other words, 81 were selected by the people, and the remaining 219 by the patrons of the boroughs. The price of a borough usually reached £2,000, but in times of great political excitement much higher sums were obtained. A select body of the peers and of the more wealthy commoners controlled the majority of the boroughs, and by means of these and a dexterous use of the Place and Pension List, the English Government was able to control the Irish House of Commons, while the House of Lords was held in check by a reckless creation of new peers, all of whom were likely to vote as requested by the English ministers.*

In these circumstances it was not strange that as in England, so, too, in Ireland, the question of Parliamentary reform was warmly agitated. The Catholics naturally welcomed the idea of reform, because they believed that no proposal could be put forward for popular representation which would exclude about 3,000,000 of the people of Ireland from any voice in the selection of members of Parliament. But in this they were grievously mistaken. Flood, Charlemont, Ogle, and the other prominent leaders were determined that their scheme of reform should not embrace the suffrage for Catholics. Their idea of a perfect Parliament for Ireland was one in which a small minority should control the representation, while the vast majority of the people were to be treated as an inferior race, too dangerous to be emancipated.

A great Convention of the Volunteers was summoned to meet in Dublin to demand Parliamentary reform. It met in the Dublin Exchange on the 10th November,

* *Grattan's Memoirs*, Vol. IV., Chap. V.

1783. Earl Bristol, bishop of Derry, anxious to secure support against Flood and Charlemont, entered into communications with the Catholic Committee. Their claims had been already rejected by a small representative conference of delegates from the four provinces, but the bishop was not unwilling to secure the Catholic support even at the price of the elective franchise. The government was thoroughly alarmed at such a proposal, but not more so than were Charlemont, Flood, and the other reform leaders. On the second day of the convention Mr. Ogle announced that Lord Kenmare, on behalf of the Catholic Committee, had authorised him to say that they did not wish the question of Catholic suffrage to be brought forward, and that they were willing to abandon all idea of pressing any further claim on the Legislature. From the public letter of Lord Kenmare, who was then absent from the city, it is clear that no permission had been given to any person to use his authority for any such message, and that the whole communication was only a disgraceful ruse adopted by the opponents of the Catholics in order to distract the convention. A meeting of the Catholic Committee, held on the same day (11th Nov.), under the presidency of Sir Patrick Bellew, promptly repudiated the supposed message from Lord Kenmare. But the trick had succeeded. Charlemont and Flood were able to secure an adjournment of the question, and the government, having learned that the convention had broken with the Catholic body, recovered sufficient courage to reject all its demands.* It is just, however, to say that not all the volunteers imitated their leaders. In many of the volunteer corps Catholics were admitted, although by law they were forbidden to carry arms, and some of the corps, notably that of Belfast, passed resolutions (1784) in favour of elective franchise for the Catholics.†

In 1782, new concessions were made to the Catholics.

* *Memoirs of Flood*, pp. 234-57. *Grattan's Memoirs*, Vol. III., pp. 104-22. Lecky, Vol. II., pp. 369 *sqq.*

† *Grattan's Memoirs*, Vol. III., pp. 227-32.

On the motion of Mr. Gardiner "An Act for the further relief of his Majesty's subjects professing the Popish religion" was passed. It enabled those Catholics who had taken the oath of 1774 to purchase and inherit land in the same way as Protestants, on condition, however, that these lands were not situated in a Parliamentary borough. It repealed an Act passed in the time of William III. directed against bishops and regulars, and permitted these to settle in the country provided they subscribed to the oath of allegiance, and registered themselves according to the manner prescribed. The ecclesiastics, however, who officiated in any church or chapel with a steeple, or at a funeral in a church or churchyard, were exempted from these privileges, as was also any person who lapsed from Protestantism to Popery, or any ecclesiastic who endeavoured to pervert persons from Protestantism. The laws permitting any two justices of the peace to force Catholics to swear where they last heard Mass, allowing Protestants to claim possession of the horse of their Catholic neighbour by tendering him £5, were also repealed, together with the statutes commanding the Catholics to provide Protestant watchmen, to make good the injuries sustained by their Protestant neighbours from the robberies of privateers, and not to reside in the cities of Limerick or Galway.* By another Act it was permitted to Catholics who had taken the oath of 1774 to act as schoolmasters provided that they received no Protestant pupils and obtained the licence of the Protestant bishop of the district. Catholic laymen, too, might act as guardians for children. But it was expressly laid down that no Catholic university, college, or endowed schools could be tolerated in the kingdom.†

These measures were noteworthy as indicating the spirit with which members of the Irish Parliament were animated at the very moment when they were flushed with a victory carried largely by Catholic support. At the same time a measure tending to legalise the inter-

* 21 & 22 Geo. III., Chap. 24.
† *Idem.*, Chap. 62.

marriage of Catholics and Protestants was rejected; and an Act passed "rendering the manner of conforming from the Popish to the Protestant religion" more easy and expeditious.

From 1783 till 1790 the Catholic question lost much of its burning interest. This is to be attributed partly to the dissensions and inactivity of the Catholic Committee, partly to the absorbing political issues which engaged the attention of the government and the Opposition. Lord Kenmare was not a leader capable of inspiring his party with energy and determination. He wished to abandon agitation and to leave the redress of the Catholic disabilities to the tender mercies of the Legislature, while, at the same time, the utterly unrepresentative character of the Committee prevented it from securing united or general support in the country. On the other hand, both the Ministers and the Opposition played a waiting game, each fearing to embroil itself by attempting a measure of relief, and each hoping that the other side might make some imprudent move.

But in this interval a great change had come over the spirit of the country. While the vast majority of the landlord class, the borough owners, the bishops and better classes of the Established Church were as violently opposed to Catholic emancipation as before, the Presbyterian party in the North of Ireland, or, more correctly, of Belfast, were anxious to secure the assistance of the Catholics in the struggle for Parliamentary reform, by offering them emancipation. They were prudent enough to realise that Flood's scheme of reform, excluding as it did two-thirds of the nation from representation, was impracticable, and that the only hope of overcoming the solid phalanx of placemen and pensioners was to win over the Catholics by inscribing on their banners, reform and emancipation. Owing to the disabilities under which they themselves laboured, the union between the Northern Presbyterians and the Catholics was not an unnatural one, and the new spirit of liberty and of toleration that was aroused by the French Revolu-

tion tended to strengthen such an alliance. Ever since the American War Belfast was regarded as dangerous by the English ministers, and the open sympathy with the revolutionaries displayed by the inhabitants did not tend to allay their apprehensions.

Nor was the Catholic body unaffected by the new democratic spirit. The Catholic merchants, especially in Dublin, were a powerful party, and were determined that they should no longer adopt the attitude of humble petitioners dependent upon the favour of the English or Irish ministers, but, rather, that they should boldly demand complete emancipation; and by the very boldness of their attitude and of their claims they hoped to arouse the enthusiasm and courage of their co-religionists. The leaders of the new party were John Keogh, Richard M'Cormick, John Sweetman, Edward Byrne and Thomas Braughall, and of these, John Keogh was generally regarded as the ablest and most advanced. These men did not conceal their dislike of the half-hearted policy of patient resignation suggested by Lord Kenmare, and the attitude adopted by the government afforded them an excellent opportunity of initiating a more self-reliant line of action.

In 1790, a deputation from the Catholic Committee waited upon the Chief Secretary, Hobart, to request the assistance of the ministers in securing some measure of redress, but they were met with a curt refusal, and to such an extent had they fallen in the public estimation that they could not find a single member who would undertake to present their petition to the House of Commons. Towards the end of the same year the Lord Lieutenant, Lord Westmorland, visited Cork, and the address prepared by the Catholics of the city on the occasion was rejected, because it expressed the hope that by their loyalty they had merited a further relaxation of the penal code. At the same time an agitation was begun in some districts against any concession to Catholics. The General Committee of the Catholics met in Dublin in February, 1791, and prepared a moderate but rather

firmly worded petition, which was presented at the Castle by a deputation from their body, but it met with no better success.* Having failed in their efforts to move the ministers, the Catholic Committee next turned to the Opposition (July, 1791), but the leaders of the Opposition confessed their inability to give them any assistance, and advised them to renew their petitions to the government.† Finally, in September, 1791, the Committee despatched John Keogh to London to interview the English ministers. From these he learned that no opposition would be offered in England if the Irish Parliament granted the Catholics admission to the legal profession and the offices of magistrates, grand jurors, and sheriffs. Furthermore, he was informed that the question of the elective franchise would be taken into serious consideration.‡

In the meantime a number of the advanced section of the Opposition party in Dublin, tired of the methods of the official leaders, began to come together to initiate a more forward policy. The principal men of this class in Dublin were Wolfe Tone, Russell, Drennan, Napper Tandy, Simon Butler and Archibald Hamilton Rowan. They were in thorough sympathy with the French Revolution and with the doctrines contained in Paine's *Rights of Man,* a book which began to have a large circulation amongst the Dissenters in Ireland. They were determined to work for the independence of Ireland and, perceiving the mistake which the Opposition had made in neglecting the claims of the Catholic body, they determined to promote a union between the Catholics and Dissenters. Some of their number entered into negotiations with Keogh, M'Cormick and others of the mercantile section of the Catholic Committee, while, on the other hand, Tone endeavoured to secure the co-operation of his Belfast friends, Neilson, Simms, Sinclair, MacDonald, &c. A resolution favouring the Catholics, drawn up by Wolfe Tone in the very mildest

* McNevin, *Pieces of Irish History*, pp. 18 *sqq.*
† *Grattan's Memoirs*, Vol. IV., p. 41.
‡ *Idem.*, p. 40.

terms was, however, rejected at a meeting of the party in Belfast (July, 1791)* It was this action that induced Tone to write the pamphlet, *An Argument on behalf of the Catholics of Ireland*, which was published in September, 1791. Tone and Russell undertook a mission to Belfast to win over the Dissenters to the new programme, and in October of the same year the first club of United Irishmen was formed in Belfast. About the same time another club was established in Dublin, of which many of the Catholic leaders became members.

The wisdom of an alliance between the Catholics and the advanced section of the Dissenters was questioned by the more moderate section of the Committee. The unconcealed sympathy of the Belfast men with the French revolutionary movement, and with the doctrines of Paine's *Rights of Man*, made them fear that this party was not utterly unselfish in undertaking to champion the Catholic cause. Though for so far nothing violent or unconstitutional had been done, yet they believed that the democratic section of the Presbyterians meant to utilise the Catholics to promote their scheme of an armed revolution, and that in such a conflict, whichever side won, the rights of religion and property would be seriously endangered. Hence, to checkmate what they considered this dangerous tendency, Lord Kenmare proposed at a meeting in December, 1791, that the removal of the Catholic grievances should be left entirely to the Legislature. This was strongly resisted by Keogh, McCormick, and Byrne, and on a division having been taken, was rejected by 90 to 17.† As a result of this vote Lord Kenmare and most of the gentry to the number of 68 seceded from the Catholic Committee, and presented a separate address to the Lord Lieutenant. They proclaimed their loyalty and submission, but at the same time they resolved "that application be made to the next session of Parliament for a further repeal of the laws affecting the Roman Catholics."

* *Memoirs of Wolfe Tone*, Vol. I., pp. 64-5.

† *Parnell's Penal Laws*, p. 134. *Memoirs of Wolfe Tone*, Vol. I., p. 61. Plowden, Vol. II., p. 334.

Both sides appealed to their co-religionists, and it is significant of the changed feelings of the people, that outside the districts where the Catholic gentry could exercise personal influence, the people were entirely on the side of the advanced section of the Catholic Committee. A meeting of the Committee was called on 14th January, 1792, and Lord Kenmare was formally expelled.*

In England, Pitt, the Prime Minister, and Dundas, Secretary of State, were undoubtedly favourable to the Catholics. A Relief Bill granting many valuable concessions to the Catholics of England had been passed in 1791. The influence of Edmund Burke contributed much to this change of sentiment and policy; and the appointment of his son, Richard Burke, as agent for the Irish Catholics seemed at the time a very prudent step. The appointment was made apparently in 1790, but it was only late in 1791 that he undertook active work. He came convinced that ample concessions were about to be made to the Catholics, and he took no pains to conceal his views. Immediately the ascendency party were up in arms. All the placemen, pensioners, borough owners, corporations, in a word, all those whose monopoly of wealth or power was dependent upon the exclusion of the Catholics, raised a howl of opposition. In December, 1791, Dundas forwarded two communications to the Lord Lieutenant, one of them to be submitted to the Irish Privy Council, the other private and confidential. In the first of these he urged that justice and expediency demanded that some concessions should be made to the Irish Catholics. In particular he urged that all restrictions imposed on them in regard to the professions, trade and manufactures, should be removed, that some of the laws against Catholic education should be relaxed, that the prohibition against intermarriage of Catholics and Protestants should be abolished, and that they should be permitted to serve on juries. Furthermore, he pointed out how dangerous it was to exclude

* *Grattan's Memoirs*, Vol. IV., p. 45.

nearly three-fourths of the population from all voice in Parliament, and strongly advocated the concession of a limited elective franchise. In the confidential letter he warned Lord Westmorland that if no measures were taken to conciliate the Catholics, and if, in their disappointment, they should league themselves with the Presbyterians and have recourse to violence, the ascendency party in Ireland might be prepared to defend themselves, as England would not supply troops to fight in such a cause.*

These communications created a panic in government circles in Ireland. A meeting of the Privy Council was called to take the proposals of Dundas into consideration. Fitzgibbon, the Chancellor, and Agar, Archbishop of Cashel, were opposed to all concessions, but in the end they agreed to accept the proposals of the Home Secretary in regard to the professions, education, intermarriage, and the admission of Catholics to serve on petty juries, but they were unanimous in declaring that the grant of the franchise to Catholics would be ruinous and impracticable. Sir John Parnell was one of a deputation sent over to interview Pitt and Dundas on behalf of the Irish government. The deputation succeeded in overcoming the scruples of the ministers; and all reference to the Catholic question was omitted from the king's speech at the opening of the Irish Parliament in January, 1792. In February, however, a private member, Sir Hercules Langrishe, introduced a Catholic Relief Bill which permitted Catholics to act as barristers, solicitors, notaries, &c., though it excluded them from the offices of king's counsel or judge. It abolished the laws against intermarriage, against the education of Catholics abroad, and the necessity of securing the licence of the Protestant bishop for a Catholic school. The bill was passed without any serious alteration, though the Dublin Corporation entered a vigorous protest against such a betrayal of Protestant interests.

* Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. III., pp. 38 *sqq.*

By the secession of December, 1791, the Catholic Committee had passed completely under the control of the more democratic section, who began to display unwonted activity. Buoyed up with hope by their secretary, Edmund Burke, they presented a petition to Parliament in January, 1792, but it had to be withdrawn on the score of informality. In February they issued an address to their Protestant fellow-countrymen, explaining precisely the extent of their demands, and disavowing all intention of intimidating the Legislature.* In the same month they prepared a new petition, which was presented to Parliament on their behalf by Mr. Egan; while at the same time two petitions were presented from Belfast and County Antrim, praying that the penal laws should be repealed, and that Catholics should be placed on the same footing as Protestants. A few days after the presentation of the address from the Catholic Committee and from Belfast, David Latouche proposed that they should be rejected without further ceremony. Strange to say, this insulting motion was supported by Brownlow, W. Ponsonby, Bushe, Beresford, Toler, Ogle, Barrington, Loftus and Maxwell, and though warmly combatted by Grattan, Curran and Egan, it was passed by 208 against 23.† A little later in the same session Mr. Foster, the Speaker of the Irish House of Commons, declared his unalterable resolution of maintaining Protestant ascendency in Ireland by maintaining a Protestant Parliament.‡

These measures convinced the Catholic Committee that no reliance could be placed either on the ministers or on the Opposition, and made them more willing to listen to the proposals of the leaders of the United Irishmen movement. Wolfe Tone was appointed paid secretary to the Catholic Committee at a salary of £200 a year. He accepted the office, and undoubtedly worked hard to promote the Catholic interests, but more especially to cement the alliance between themselves and

* *Parnell's Penal Laws*, pp. 146-52.
† *Report on the Debates on Roman Catholic Relief Bill*, Dublin, 1792.
‡ *Grattan's Memoirs*, Vol. IV., p. 66.

the Dissenters of the North. It is clear, however, from his own diary * that with the Catholic religion as such he had very little sympathy, and that his motive in accepting the secretaryship was not unmixed love of the Catholic cause. By the efforts of several friends a union was once more effected between the seceders and the Committee, and both sides promised to co-operate in securing the elective franchise. Such a demand had been rendered absolutely necessary by the fact that landlords, anxious to secure political patronage, were driving out their Catholic tenants in order to make way for Protestant voters.†

In the recent debates in the House of Commons it had been urged against the Committee that its members were a self-constituted Committee, representing nobody but themselves. To remove the grounds for such a charge, and at the same time to secure the more active co-operation of their own body in the provinces, it was decided to introduce from the counties and provincial cities an elected element which, together with the Dublin members, might be empowered to speak on behalf of the Catholics of Ireland. A plan for such an election by parochial and county committees was drawn up and passed, and a summons was issued for a great Catholic convention to be held in Dublin in December, 1792.‡

Lord Westmorland and the Irish ministers, notably the Chancellor, Fitzgibbon, spared no pains to stir up the old sectarian bigotry during the autumn of 1791 and the early portion of 1792. Their letters to England teemed with accounts of the wild spirit of insurrection which had taken possession of the Catholics and Dissenters, and of the dangers to Protestantism which would ensue if Pitt or Dundas so much as breathed a syllable about the Catholic franchise. The issue of the summons to the Catholic convention created a perfect storm in the country. Petitions, couched in the most violent language, and calling upon the government to

* *E.g.*, Vol. II., p. 278.
† *Report of Debates in* 1793, Introduction I., XXVI.
‡ *Wolfe Tone's Memoirs*, Vol. I., pp. 85 *sqq.*

prevent such an unconstitutional step, were sent by the grand juries, the corporations, and the public bodies throughout the country. The monopoly of the Established Church in Ireland was at last seriously threatened, and to make the situation more alarming the Catholics and Dissenters appeared to be working in perfect unison. But the days when the grand juries and borough owners could stifle the voice of the country were passed. The Catholics adopted a defiant attitude, and seemed determined to give blow for blow. The question of the legality of the convention was submitted by them to two distinguished lawyers, Simon Butler and Beresford Burton, both of whom declared that the projected assembly was perfectly constitutional.

Meanwhile, the preparation for the convention was being carried on rapidly by the Catholic Committee. Tone and Russell and their friends endeavoured to win over the Presbyterians of Belfast, and succeeded to such an extent that a delegation from the Catholic Committee which visited the city (July, 1792) received a generous welcome.* Representatives of both sides tried to quell the disturbances between the Peep-of-Day Boys, who were Protestants, and the Defenders, who were Catholics, but it was only in a few districts that their efforts were successful. At the same time it was necessary not to frighten the more conservative section of the Catholics, who were now seriously alarmed by the sentiments of friendship for the French revolutionary party professed openly both in Dublin and Belfast. To allay the scruples of this body it was necessary to secure the co-operation or neutrality of the bishops in regard to the convention. John Keogh and others of the sub-Committee visited the individual bishops, and brought about a complete understanding between the entire Catholic body. The election of delegates to the convention was carried out with great enthusiasm during the months of September, October, and November.† The Lord

* *Wolfe Tone's Memoirs*, Appendix pp. 399 *sqq.*

† For names of delegates, *cf.* :—*Report on Debates*, 1793, XI.-XXVI.

Lieutenant and Lord Chancellor, disappointed in their hopes of being able to suppress the assembly, consoled themselves by reporting to the English ministry that great dissensions had broken out amongst the Catholics, and that the convention was likely to prove a failure.

Beyond doubt they endeavoured to create disunion, but they were doomed to complete disappointment. The delegates, to the number of 300, met in Dublin on the 3rd December, 1792. As a body they constituted an assembly of which any nation might well be proud. They conducted their deliberations in such an earnest, courageous and moderate manner that not even their bitterest enemies could find anything to assail. Edward Byrne, a well-known Dublin merchant, and a member of the sub-Committee, was appointed chairman, and it was decreed that "the Catholic peers, prelates and delegates were alone competent to speak the sense of the Catholics of Ireland." The second resolution declared that a petition be presented to his Majesty, stating their grievances, and praying relief. On the question, however, of how much they should demand there was a difference of opinion at first, but an amendment requesting that Catholics "should be restored to the equal enjoyment of the blessings of the constitution" was carried amidst enthusiastic applause. In order to mark their opinion of the conduct of his Majesty's ministers in Ireland, it was determined that the petition should not be sent to the Lord Lieutenant for transmission to the king, but that delegates should be selected by the convention to carry it to London. The delegates selected were Edward Byrne, John Keogh, Christopher Bellew, James Devereux and Sir Thomas French. The bishops, who were also assembled in Dublin, sent two of their body, Dr. Troy of Dublin and Dr. Moylan of Cork, to the convention to express their thorough sympathy with the terms of the petition, and to affix their signatures on behalf of the bishops of Ireland. The delegates started for London, travelling by Belfast, where they received a popular ovation, and the convention was

suspended till the result of their mission might be made known.*

The moderation of the Catholic convention and the success of the French arms on the Continent forced the Irish government to be less violent in their reports to England on the Catholic question. Lord Westmorland admitted that he could carry the elective franchise if he were forced to it, but that he considered that the concession of votes to Catholics would be ruinous to the connection between England and Ireland. The Lord Chancellor, Fitzgibbon, he said, the Speaker, Foster, and Sir John Parnell, were strong against yielding to the demands of the convention, as were also Ponsonby, Connolly and Lord Shannon.† The Whig Club, which was formerly the great rallying point of the Opposition, refused to allow the question to be discussed, and the only prominent men who stood firm in their loyalty to the Catholics were Grattan and the Duke of Leinster, the founders of the new club, "The Friends of the Constitution." When the delegates from the Catholic body arrived in London (18th Dec., 1792) they demanded an audience with the king, and though Dundas showed some reluctance in acceding to their wishes, he was obliged to yield. On 2nd January, 1793, they were received at St. James's. Though no definite assurances were given, the general impression left on the minds of the delegates was that Dundas and the English ministers were not hostile to complete Catholic emancipation. The independence of the Irish Parliament was put forward as the pretext for not defining the exact measures that should be introduced.‡

The Irish Parliament met on the 10th January, 1793. A copy of the king's speech, in which absolute silence was maintained in regard to the Catholic demands, was sent over from Ireland to London for approbation, but in London a clause was inserted in their favour, and the

* *Wolfe Tone's Memoirs*, Vol. I., pp. 101-119. Wyse, *Catholic Association*, Vol. I., pp. 157 *sqq.*

† Lecky, Vol. III., pp. 117 *sqq.*

‡ *Memoirs of Wolfe Tone*, p. 123.

Lord Lieutenant was commanded to have it read in that form. The members of the House of Commons were requested "to apply themselves to the consideration of such measures as might be most likely to strengthen and cement a general union of all classes and descriptions of his Majesty's subjects in support of the established constitution"; with this view, it was said, his Majesty trusted that the situation of his Majesty's Catholic subjects would engage their serious attention, and in the consideration of this subject he relied on the wisdom and liberality of his Parliament.* This royal communication was remarkable for its style as well as its substance. Formerly it had been customary to refer to the Catholics in official statements as "Papists" or "persons professing the Popish religion." In the bill introduced by Sir Hercules Langrishe in 1792 they were designated as Roman Catholics, but now they were called simply Catholics. The change was small, but at that particular juncture sufficiently significant.

On the 4th February Hobart asked leave to introduce a Catholic Relief Bill. The measure as proposed conceded much, but it fell far short of complete emancipation. Only from a small group inspired by Fitzgibbon, the son of a pervert, and led by Duigenan, himself a pervert, Ogle and Latouche was anything like unqualified opposition offered to the bill. This party stood up for the full ascendency claim, namely, "a Protestant king, a Protestant Parliament, a Protestant hierarchy, Protestant electors and government, the bench of justice, the army, and the revenue, through all their branches and detail, Protestant." The Speaker of the House, Sir John Foster, opposed the measure, though in a more restrained fashion. Sir John Parnell agreed to vote on its behalf, but showed clearly that he deemed the concession highly dangerous. Ponsonby, who was opposed to emancipation the previous year, now determined to outbid or embarrass the government by supporting the claim of the Catholics to sit and vote in Parliament.

* *Parliamentary Debates*, Chap. XIII., p. 3.

Grattan and the Duke of Leinster maintained a consistent attitude of friendliness throughout the discussions. While the bill was before Parliament negotiations were continued between the Catholic Committee and the Chief Secretary, Hobart. The instructions of the convention to the Committee had been that they should accept nothing less than complete emancipation; while, on the other hand, Hobart insisted that unless they declared themselves satisfied with his measure, the government would drop the bill and force matters to a crisis. The position was an exceedingly difficult one for the members of the Committee. On the one hand, they felt themselves bound by the instructions of the convention and by the pledges which some of them had made to the United Irishmen of Belfast; while, on the other, they could not help seeing that there was no hope of carrying complete emancipation, and that in the panic created by the fear of a French invasion the Opposition was more violent in its measures than the government, that an Alien Act directed against foreign emissaries, an Arms Act directed against the Volunteers were agreed to, and that all parties were willing to increase the militia and regular forces in Ireland. On the other hand, they could count on the support of only a number of the more intelligent of the Presbyterians of Belfast and the North, who favoured emancipation because it suited their own political designs. Hence, in the circumstances, the majority of the Committee favoured the acceptance of the measure. It was passed by large majorities in both Houses, and received the royal assent in April, 1793.

The Relief Bill removed the remaining disabilities of the Catholics regarding landed property, permitted them to vote for members of Parliament or for magistrates in any city or borough, to become members of any corporation with the exception of Trinity College, to receive degrees in Trinity College, to act as professors in any college which might be founded in Dublin University and not intended exclusively for Catholics, to serve

on grand juries or petty juries, to hold all military or civil offices, with certain exceptions set out in the bill, and to carry arms if possessed of property valued for a certain amount. The enjoyment of these privileges was made conditional upon taking a certain new form of oath or declaration embodied in the act. They were still excluded from both Houses of Parliament, from all offices or emoluments in Trinity College, from the position of sheriff or sub-sheriff or deputy governor of counties, and from all the great offices of trust in the administration, the law and the army. By means of these restrictions the Protestant ascendency was still almost as securely entrenched as it had been before the agitation was begun. The Catholics had votes, but they could utilise them only for Protestants, and that, too, at the bidding of their landlords; they could serve on juries, but the sheriffs to whom the compilation of the panel was entrusted should be Protestant; they might become members of corporations, but the corporations remained closed against them for nearly half a century; they could enter Trinity College as students, but its offices and emoluments were still reserved for men of another creed. The Relief Bill of 1793 could not, therefore, satisfy the Catholics of Ireland. The attitude adopted by the Irish House of Commons in resisting every motion for redress until forced to yield by the English ministers, stirred up as they were by fear of civil war, and the tone of many of the speeches made during the discussion of the measure in both Houses, served only to embitter the Catholic party, and to make them seek for redress by means other than constitutional agitation. The Catholic convention was dissolved in April, 1793.

Fear of a French invasion, and the alarming spread of republican ideas in Belfast and the North, to some extent alarmed both the official Opposition and the ministers. A secret committee of the House of Lords was appointed to examine into the causes of the disturbances, and every effort was made to involve the Catholic Committee in the outrages committed by the Defenders, but without

success. An Arms Act, an Indemnity Act, a Convention Act levelled against assemblies similar to the Volunteer and Catholic conventions, and a Militia Act were quickly hurried through. The Volunteers and the projected National Guards were suppressed and disarmed, and soldiers were drafted into the disaffected areas. During the remainder of the year 1793 and 1794 the state of the country went from bad to worse. The extreme party, led by Tone, Hamilton Rowan, Butler and the Presbyterian leaders of Belfast, denounced the weak attitude of the Opposition. Negotiations were opened with France to procure French assistance, and the society of the United Irishmen underwent a complete transformation. Their programme was no longer reform and emancipation, but complete separation from England. The leaders, Butler, Bond and Hamilton Rowan were arrested and imprisoned, the Rev. Mr. Jackson, an agent from France, was seized (April, 1794) and condemned, and Wolfe Tone, through the intercession of his friends, was allowed to leave the country (1795). Grattan was as zealous against this extreme party as was the government. He foresaw that they were only playing into the hands of the English ministers in abandoning the prospect of securing Parliamentary reform and emancipation by constitutional agitation, in order to stake their fortunes on an armed rebellion, which, if it failed, could lead only to the destruction of the Irish Parliament; if it succeeded, to the triumph of the French revolutionary principles and of the French military power.

In England, the junction of Burke, Portland, Spencer, Fitzwilliam and Windham with the party of Pitt involved serious consequences for Ireland. The administration of the country was apparently to be handed over to the Prime Minister's new allies, who began at once to negotiate with Grattan and Ponsonby and the leaders of the Opposition. Earl Fitzwilliam was appointed Lord Lieutenant in Ireland, on the understanding that he was to have power to remove the officials hostile to a policy of conciliation, and to yield to the demand for emanci-

pation if the Catholics should show themselves bent on securing it.* His appointment was hailed with joy by the friends of reform and of emancipation, while, on the other hand, it was denounced by Fitzgibbon and his friends as a betrayal of the country. Grattan and Ponsonby were summoned to London to confer with the ministers and to arrange the details of the new programme.

Earl Fitzwilliam landed in Dublin early in January, 1795. The Catholic Committee, which, owing to the attempts made to connect it with the party of rebellion, had been quiet during the year 1794, began to display renewed activity. Petitions poured in on all sides demanding complete emancipation. The Lord Lieutenant, who had pledged himself not to encourage such a movement, endeavoured to procure the approval of the Catholic party for a postponement of the question, but even Lords Kenmare and Fingall, whom he consulted, assured him that such a step was utterly impossible, that all sections of their party were united on this question, and that any delay on the part of the government must inevitably lead to disturbance.† The Lord Lieutenant announced the state of affairs to the ministers in England, and begged for permission to introduce or support a measure of complete emancipation; while, at the same time, he sought their approval for the dismissal of Hamilton, the Under Secretary, Cooke, the Secretary for War, Wolfe and Toler, the Attorney- and Solicitor-General, and John Beresford, the Commissioner of Revenue. Of these, Beresford, on account of his family connections, was the most powerful, and the most likely to involve the new administration in serious difficulty.

Pitt and his friends began to repent their error in handing over the government of Ireland to the Whig party. They foresaw that Catholic emancipation and Parliamentary reform were certain to be carried, and that, as a result, the Union, upon which they had already set their hearts, would be rendered difficult, if not im-

* Lecky, Vol. III., pp. 239 *sqq.*
† Letter of Earl Fitzwilliam, 15th Jan., 1795.

possible. Hence, having secured the vote of large supplies of men and money for the war, they began to object to the policy of Fitzwilliam, to charge him with exceeding his powers in dismissing the Irish officials and in encouraging the Catholics to hope for emancipation. Such charges can be shown from the published correspondence to have been utterly groundless, but they served their purpose, and, to the dismay of all, Fitzwilliam was dismissed from office, and ordered to appoint lords justices, who might govern the country till the arrival of his successor (23rd Feb., 1795).

Lord Camden was appointed as his successor, and with his appointment begins the saddest chapter in Irish history. His instructions were to resist all demands for emancipation, but at the same time to endeavour to conciliate the Catholics by establishing seminaries and arranging for a state payment of their clergy. The debate on the Catholic Relief Bill, which had been introduced already by Grattan, began on the 4th May, and after a bitter discussion lasting two days the second reading was rejected by 158 to 48.* The result of the division taught the Catholic leaders that little hope could be entertained from petitions to the Irish House of Commons.

Long before this period Pitt and his friends had turned their attention to the plan of a Union between England and Ireland.† So long as the Irish Parliament was independent, no matter how carefully English influence was buttressed by liberal corruption doled out to the placemen and pensioners, there was still the danger that when any serious foreign complications should arise, the Irish Parliament might pursue its own course, unmindful of the interests of England, with disastrous results for the connection between both countries. But since the Catholic question had come to the front in 1791 it is certain from the official correspondence of the time that Pitt was convinced that the Union was an absolute necessity. On the one hand, he felt that the

* *Grattan's Memoirs*, Vol. IV., p. 230.
† *Correspondence between Pitt and the Duke of Rutland*, Edinburgh, 1890.

emancipation of nearly three-fourths of the nation could not be postponed indefinitely, and that once the Catholics were placed on an equality with Protestants, and permitted to sit and vote in the Houses of Parliament, their numbers would inevitably tell in the struggle, and the government of Ireland would pass into Catholic hands. On the other hand, he believed that a Catholic Ireland, with an independent Parliament, was sure to come into conflict with England, and by an alliance with some Catholic nation on the Continent create a standing menace to England. He thought, too, that the Protestants, having lost the monopoly of place and power, by means of which their loyalty had been bought hitherto, might change their attitude, ally themselves with their Catholic countrymen and strengthen them in the fight for separation.*

Hence, he resolved to adopt the old policy of playing one party against the other, of favouring the Catholics in order to create a panic amongst the Protestant monopolists, of teaching both parties that they must depend upon English ministers for support, and by these means of winning over both to betray their national independence. Nothing could have succeeded better in promoting the prospects of a Union than the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam, and the appointment of Earl Camden in 1795. The new Lord Lieutenant set himself to stir up religious bigotry, to divide class from class, to virtually suspend the constitution, and by so doing to drive the people into rebellion.

The government set itself by means of the landlords, the borough owners, grand jurors, and the usual clique of hangers-on to rouse the bigotry of the Protestants in the North in order to prevent a junction of their forces with the Catholics. The tone of the speeches on the Catholic question was intended to create a distrust of, and contempt for, the Catholics. The Peep-of-Day Boys, who were composed of the lowest classes of the Protestant and Presbyterian population, made them-

* Lecky, Vol. III., pp. 73, 96-7.

selves specially obnoxious at this period. This society began about 1785, and appears to have had its origin in a riot between Catholics and Protestants. Both parties began to organise their forces, the Protestant combination being known as the Peep-of-Day Boys, the Catholics as Defenders. Beyond doubt, the Catholics in the beginning were merely acting in self-defence, though at a later period the conduct of the Defenders in certain districts could admit of no justification. Under the patronage of the magistrates, and fearing no opposition from the administration of Lord Camden, the Peep-of-Day Boys deliberately set themselves to drive the Catholics out of Armagh, Down, Antrim and Tyrone. On 21st September, 1795, the two parties came into conflict at the Diamond, about thirty of the Catholics being killed in the encounter; and on the evening of that day, flushed with the victory they had won, the Protestant party formed the first Orange lodge. It was a secret society, open only to Protestants, and in the beginning, at least, animated with the greatest hatred of Catholicity. The outrages against the Catholics, especially in the County Armagh, were multiplied. Their houses were burned, and they were threatened that unless they left the country their lives would not be spared. The number of Catholics driven from the single county of Armagh probably fell little short of 7,000. These poor people took refuge for the greater part in Connaught, where they were dependent upon the charity of their own co-religionists. Some of the magistrates were anxious to do their duty, but the government authorities gave them little encouragement, and though the matter was brought under the notice of the House of Commons by Grattan and his friends no serious measures were taken to defend the Catholics. Lord Camden, Fitzgibbon, and the other friends of the Union were not displeased to see the Presbyterians joining with the members of the Established Church in their persecution of the Catholics.*

* Lecky, Vol. III., p. 440.

The Defenders were a secret society, composed exclusively of Catholics. It began about 1785, and aimed merely at defending the Catholics against the persecution of the Protestant rioters. For a long period it was confined almost entirely to the North of Ireland, but after the disappointment of 1793, and the recall of Lord Fitzwilliam in 1794, the society spread rapidly in different parts of Ireland, more especially in the midland districts. It was at first quite distinct from the United Irishmen, and had no connection whatsoever with the latter body. In some districts, however, the peasants were undoubtedly influenced by French revolutionary principles, and oaths were taken to assist the French invaders should they effect a landing in the country.* As the Catholic body lost hope, the society spread rapidly, and smarting under the terrible provocation received from the ascendency classes, they took the law into their own hands, and were guilty of very serious crimes. The bishops and many of the clergy denounced the horrible excesses of the Defenders, but without any result, except to incur their mortal hatred and to be threatened with a general refusal to contribute to the support of the clergy. The government of Lord Camden adopted violent and illegal measures against the society. Lord Carhampton was sent into Connaught, and he seized a large number of the Defenders, and despatched them to a sailing vessel on the coast (1795). Without any trial they were transported to serve as sailors on the fleet, and the Act of Indemnity was passed to cover such injustice with the cloak of legality.† On the other hand, the society of United Irishmen, which was established in 1791, aimed at uniting all classes to struggle for reform and emancipation. Whatever may have been the ultimate objects of the Presbyterian leaders of this body, such as Wolfe Tone, Rowan, Russel, Neilson and the others, they took care to conceal their plans in order to secure the co-operation

* MacNevin, *Pieces of Irish History*, p. 71.
† *Grattan's Memoirs*, Vol. IV., 239 *sqq.*

of the Catholics. At first the society was perfectly constitutional, both in its objects and its means, but after 1794, when it was plain that the government would not yield to constitutional pressure, it underwent a change and became a secret military organisation aiming at the establishment of a republican government, and relying for assistance on the government of France. By his position as secretary to the Catholic Committee Wolfe Tone was enabled to win over the more advanced section of the Catholics to the United Irishmen. But till the latter part of 1796 or the beginning of 1797 the society had made comparatively little progress in the Catholic districts. At that period, however, a union between the Defenders and the United Irishmen was effected, and the Catholics joined their ranks in great numbers.*

The Catholic bishops and clergy were undoubtedly hostile to these combinations, and denounced them in no unsparing terms. Nor, if the circumstances be fairly considered, could they be expected to have acted in any other manner. Although sympathising fully with their persecuted people, they could not shut their eyes to the fact that the leaders of the movement were to a large extent under the influence of the French revolutionary principles, and depending upon the assistance of the Directory for the establishment of an Irish republic. Wolfe Tone, in his diary, rejoiced in the dethronement of the Pope (1796), as a sign that the world was about to be emancipated from the yoke of religious and political superstition under which it had long groaned,† and Wolfe Tone may be taken as typical of his class. The French government upon which they relied for support was one which had declared war upon Catholicity and Christianity, and had left no stone unturned to uproot revealed religion, as far as it was possible to do so. If the United Irishmen leaders succeeded with the aid of a French army in setting up a republic,

* McNevin, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-21.
† *Memoirs of Wolfe Tone*, Vol. II., p. 278.

they feared that the French might do in Ireland as they had already done in various states of Italy and in the Netherlands, treat the country as a French province, to be governed by the irreligious principles of the Republic; and, on the other hand, if they failed, as, considering the means at the disposal of each party, they were likely to fail, all the success that had been won by constitutional agitation would be forfeited and a new era of persecution begun. They realised that a rebellion in the circumstances was exactly what the ascendency party in Ireland desired, and they used all their powers to prevent it.

But the efforts of the clergy were frustrated by the government. At the opening of Parliament in January, 1796, an Indemnity Act was passed, together with a most severe Insurrection Act, and the *Habeas Corpus* Act was suspended. Under cover of these measures wholesale arrests and imprisonments were carried out, and the country was practically placed under martial law. Yeomanry corps, composed of the lowest classes of the Protestants, were organised and allowed to act with the greatest cruelty towards the Catholics. When Grattan brought forward his resolution in favour of the Catholic emancipation in October, 1796, he could find no support from any section of the House, and the motion was rejected by 146 to 12. On another resolution introduced by him, favouring the admission of Catholics to Parliament, he was defeated by 143 to 19.* In face of such facts it is not to be wondered at that the Catholics determined to drop all minor issues, and fight for complete separation. Finally, in 1797, Grattan and his few faithful followers, shocked by the illegalities and violence of the government, and anxious to have no responsibility where they could exercise no control, gave up the struggle in despair and retired from Parliament. Henceforth, the battle was to be fought with different weapons.

The government well knew from its spies that an

* *Grattan's Memoirs*, Vol. IV., p. 257.

insurrection was being prepared, and only waited till the proper moment should come for striking a decisive blow. In March, 1798, the leaders in Dublin were arrested or scattered, and in May the rebellion broke out in the Dublin district. It was quickly suppressed. Not so, however, the outbreak which occurred in Wexford, and which was occasioned more by the wanton cruelty of the military than by any efforts of the United Irishmen. Some of the chapels in Wexford were burned, and a few of the priests headed their people in the struggle. For a few months Wexford was destined to witness all the horrors of a cruel war, in which both sides were guilty of excesses. But the balance of the account in this respect is clearly in favour of the military operating against a half-armed and undisciplined peasantry, driven to desperation by illegal persecution. During the conflict some attempt was made by the Presbyterian leaders in the North to carry out their portion of the contract, but without any notable success. The vast body of their co-religionists, influenced by the Orange Society, and unwilling to embark in what they considered a hopeless struggle, held aloof, and the men of Wexford were left to their fate. Many of the Presbyterians offered their services to the government to suppress the rebellion, and from the four counties of Fermanagh, Tyrone, Derry and Armagh no less than fourteen thousand yeomen were enrolled, three-fourths of whom were Presbyterians.* By July the rebellion was suppressed, but in the next month a small French force under General Humbert landed at Killala, and created a veritable panic amongst the Castle authorities. They were, however, surrounded on their march towards the midlands and obliged to surrender. The soldiers had finished their work, and the courts were now set in motion to enforce the severest penalties against the unfortunate people. When all life had been crushed out of the nation by the soldiers and the courtmartials it was deemed safe to bring forward the question of a Union. Lord Corn-

* Lecky, Vol. IV., pp. 403-16.

wallis arrived in Ireland as Lord Lieutenant in June, 1799, and Lord Castlereagh was appointed Chief Secretary. To these two was committed the task of suppressing the Irish Parliament.

With the general history of the shameless bribery and corruption by means of which the Union was accomplished it is not necessary to deal, except in so far as it relates to the attitude of the Catholics at the period. The ministers in England and Ireland were convinced that if the Catholics were unanimous in resisting the measure the Union could not be carried, and, hence, every effort was made to secure their support, or, at least, their neutrality. Pitt wished at first to incorporate an emancipation clause in the Act of Union, but he was over-ruled by Fitzgibbon and the leaders of the bigoted section in Ireland. They declared that such a clause would stir up the Protestants to offer the measure their most strenuous resistance. Lord Chancellor Fitzgibbon did not rest satisfied until Pitt had given him ample assurances on the matter.* It was then felt necessary to win over the Catholics in some other manner. The Irish ministers were instructed to assure the Catholic representatives that the English Government could never consent to their emancipation so long as the Irish Parliament was independent, that owing to their numbers such a step would be a betrayal of the Protestant interests, by means of which the country had been held in subjection, that it would deluge the country in blood, and that no sane government could consent to it.† On the other hand, it was pointed out that once a Union had been effected all objections to emancipation on the part of the Protestant minority in Ireland, or of the English Government were certain to disappear. In a United Parliament neither the Irish Protestants nor the English ministers could have the same reason for resisting the admission of Catholics into the House of Commons.

* *Castlereagh's Correspondence*, Vol. II., pp. 29-30.
† *Idem.*, p. 147.

At the same time, while Pitt used language which indicated that emancipation would immediately follow the Union, he took care not to give any definite pledges lest he should irritate the bigots in Ireland, or should excite the suspicions of George III., who was well known to be opposed to such a concession. When Cornwallis pressed the Cabinet for instructions in regard to the attitude he should adopt towards the Catholics, he was informed "that the Cabinet was favourable to the principle of the measure, that some doubt was entertained as to the possibility of admitting Catholics into some of the higher offices, and that ministers apprehended considerable repugnance to the measure in many quarters, and particularly in the highest, but that, as far as the sentiments of the Cabinet were concerned, his Excellency need not hesitate in calling forth the Catholic support in whatever degree he found it practicable." * In consequence of this communication Cornwallis felt himself justified in leading the Catholics to believe that their emancipation was sure to follow if only they supported the Union, but the Catholics and Cornwallis were soon to learn how much reliance could be placed upon a communication of the English Cabinet.

The Catholics of Ireland had no reason to cherish sentiments of attachment towards the Irish Parliament. It was the citadel of Protestant monopoly in the country. The very idea of allowing Catholics to enter this stronghold was resisted even by the vast majority of the men who wished for a reform of the Parliament. Flood, Charlemont, Foster, Parnell, were almost as firm against such a proposal as were Fitzgibbon, Duigenan, Ogle and the extreme champions of Protestant Ascendency. The Ponsonbys, too, could not be relied upon. Grattan, indeed, saw that until Catholic equality was decreed Ireland could never be an independent nation, but Grattan was the voice of one crying in the wilderness. Nearly every measure for the relief of the Catholics that had been passed in the Irish Parliament

* *Castlereagh's Correspondence*, Vol. IV., p. 10.

was the result of dictation from the English ministers, who hoped by these means to accustom the Catholics to look to England for a redress of their grievances.

Besides, the great body of the Catholic people were smarting under the terrible defeat which they had sustained. Their rebellion had been painted as a "Popish rebellion," and the victory of the government was hailed as another victory of the ascendency in Ireland. In the struggle, too, they had been deserted by the great body of those upon whom they had good reason to rely. They believed that the monopolists would use their new power unsparingly, and that, instead of granting emancipation, they were more likely to take away the few concessions that had been made. Hence, it was not unnatural that they should display no great anxiety to defend an establishment which stood as the symbol of their own degradation.

The Catholic peers and men of property were thorougly alarmed at the spread of revolutionary principles in Ireland, and at the attempts made by the leaders of the United Irishmen to link their fortunes with those of a government which had trampled upon the rights of property and of religion. Whatever they may have thought about the vast body of their co-religionists they distrusted the influence of the new leaders, and would have regarded their triumph with more nervousness than could have been produced by the scheme of a union of the Parliaments. With this party was Dr. Troy, the archbishop of Dublin, a member of the Dominican order, and a man of irreproachable life. But, trained on the Continent, where every popular agitation was regarded as dangerous, and where principles of submission to the established authority were pushed to the most extreme conclusions, he was not the man likely to adopt an attitude embarrassing to the government at the period. Alarmed at the excesses of some of the Defenders, and at the alliance of his countrymen with the French republican authority, he looked to the government to establish order, and he was led to

believe that the Union was the only means of putting an end to the sectional struggles which had convulsed the nation during the previous ten years. He allowed himself to be duped by the promises of Cornwallis and Castlereagh, and to be used by them in endeavouring to secure Catholic support for the measure. By means of him communications were opened with the other bishops, and though many of them showed themselves unwilling to yield to his requests, a large number of them allowed him to use their names in favour of the measure.

Though several Catholic districts, acting upon the instigation of the landlords, petitioned in favour of the Union, yet it is incorrect to say that the Catholics strongly supported the measure. In many places they were in such a condition of terrorism that they were unable to make their voices heard. But in other places they were strongly against the Union. In December, 1798, a meeting of the leading Catholics, lay and cleric, was held at Lord Fingall's to discuss the attitude they should adopt in regard to the Union. Lord Kenmare wrote strongly in its favour, but the general opinion of the meeting was against publishing any declaration, and the meeting adjourned *sine die*.* A few days later Castlereagh was obliged to report that the Catholics were still strongly against them, and that it was thought orders to that effect had been sent out from Dublin.† The Catholics were, undoubtedly, adopting a waiting attitude in order to strike a bargain with the Opposition. If the Opposition were really determined on preventing the Union, it was felt that they ought to rally the Catholics to their side by offering them emancipation in a reformed Irish Parliament. Negotiations were opened to bring about such a confederation, but Foster, who, owing to the death of Charlemont and the retirement of Grattan, was one of the leading men in the Opposition, refused to agree to emancipation. He detested the Union much, but he detested emancipation

* *Castlereagh Memoirs*, Vol. II., pp. 46, 61.
† *Idem.*, p. 84.

more, and was willing to allow the Irish Parliament to be destroyed rather than permit it to be contaminated by the presence of Catholics.* He lived to repent the blunder he had made, but his repentance came too late to save the situation.

On the other hand, Castlereagh and his friends were not idle. Having secured the co-operation of the Protestant borough owners for his schemes by wholesale bribery, he bethought himself that the same means might be adopted with equal success in the case of the Catholic gentry and leaders. Lord Kenmare was offered an earldom, which he accepted, and received in addition favours for his relatives. Myles Keon, who took such a leading part in framing the new constitution for the Catholic Committee in 1793, was won over by the promise of a provision for his son. William Bellew of Louth, who had been a prominent opponent of the Union in the early stages of the discussion, was secured after several interviews with Lord Cornwallis by the promise of the chairmanship of the Quarter Sessions in Louth. Theobald M'Kenna, an able writer on the Catholic side, received a pension of £300 a year. Mr. Donnellan, brother-in-law to Lord Fingall, accepted a similar pension, and the co-operation of Mr. Lynch was obtained by the offer of the chairmanship of Galway Quarter Sessions.†

Still it is clear that the great body of the Catholics were opposed to the measure. Even though the better classes in Kerry were won over by the influence of Lord Kenmare, a small section in Cork by the promises of the establishment of a naval depot, and various other districts by the exertions of the interested classes, still the letters of Lord Castlereagh establish the fact that the counties of Louth, Carlow, Wicklow, Kildare, Cavan and Dublin were strongly opposed to the measure, that Monaghan, Donegal, Kilkenny, Leitrim, Limerick, Longford, Meath, Queen's County, Roscommon, Sligo,

* *Grattan's Memoirs*, Vol. V., p. 69.
† MacDonagh, *The Viceroy's Postbag*, London, 1904, pp. 176-93.

and Westmeath were divided.* From the letters of Dr. Bodkin, the archbishop of Tuam, it is evident that the feeling against the Union was very decided in the West.† Dr. Plunkett of Meath stated that the Catholics of his diocese were against it,‡ and the same is insinuated in the letters of Dr. Bray, the archbishop of Cashel. At a great meeting of the Catholic body held in Dublin resolutions against the Union were carried with the greatest enthusiasm. The position of the Irish Catholics towards the Union was not, therefore, unanimous, and, if all the circumstances of the period be dispassionately considered, it would have been strange had it been otherwise.

(*b*) Ireland from the Union till Emancipation (1800-1829)

In addition to the works cited above, *cf.* :—*Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel:* Part I., *The Roman Catholic Question*, London, 1856-7. O'Connell, *Life and Speeches of Daniel O'Connell*, 2 vols., Dublin, 1846. Fitzpatrick, *Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell*, 2 vols., London, 1888. *O'Connell Centenary Record*, Dublin, 1878. McCullagh, *Memoirs of Richard Lalor Sheil*, 2 vols., London, 1855. Fitzpatrick, *Life of Dr. Doyle, Bishop of Kildare*, 2 vols., Dublin, 1890. Meagher, *Notices of the Life and Character of Archbishop Murray*, Dublin, 1853. O'Reilly, *Life of John MacHale*, 2 vols., New York, 1890. Milner, *Supplementary Memoirs*, London, 1823. Brück, *Das Irische Veto*, Mayence, 1879. Lecky, *Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland*, London, 1886. Amherst, *History of Catholic Emancipation*, 2 vols., London, 1886.

Once it became evident that the penal laws must be repealed, and that the English rule in Ireland could not be maintained for ever by the policy of promoting Protestant ascendency, it became necessary to devise some means of controlling the Catholic Church in Ireland, and of thereby securing the loyalty of the Irish people. Various inquiries were made with regard to the position

* *Castlereagh's Correspondence*, Vol. II., p. 339.
† *Idem.*, p. 347.
‡ *Idem.*, p. 437.

of the Catholic Church in other countries, and about the methods by which the governments assured themselves of the obedience and attachment of the bishops and clergy. Sir John Hippisley, the confidential agent of the English government in the Papal States (1791-1796), presented elaborate accounts of the state control exercised by the civil authorities of other nations in the affairs of the Catholic Church. It was pointed out that by means of the royal *Placet* on the nomination of the bishops, and the state payment of the clergy, the rulers of Catholic countries were able to crush out any opposition among the ecclesiastics.

It became advisable, therefore, for the English ministers, when a repeal of the whole or part of the penal laws became a political necessity, to consider seriously whether they might not utilise similar weapons in order to assure themselves of the loyalty of the Catholic clergy, and more especially of the Irish Catholic clergy, the most submissive of whom were regarded in England with grave distrust. Even Dr. Troy did not escape the suspicion of having been involved in rebellious schemes. Many circumstances concurred to secure the triumph of such measures. The former friends of the English Catholic Committee, filled with the spirit only too common on the Continent at this period, were willing to meet nearly every demand that could be made upon them by the government, and had already shown by their action that they looked to the civil authorities to free them from the dangers of "Ultramontanism." The Scotch bishops, Drs. Hay and Chisholm, had gratefully accepted some slight assistance for themselves and their clergy in 1798, and Dr. Douglass was most anxious that some provision of the same kind should be made for the clergy in England.* In the appointment of Catholic bishops in Canada the English Government had arrogated to itself the privileges conceded to the kings of France, and had claimed a voice in the nomination to Canadian sees.

* *Castlereagh*, Vol. III., p. 81.

It is not strange, therefore, that English ministers determined to control the Irish clergy by offering them state payment, and by obtaining at the same time some control over the appointment of their bishops and more important officials. So early as 1782 the scheme must have been mooted, for in that year Burke, in his *Letter to an Irish Peer,* mentioned the project of a state payment of the clergy and the concession to the civil authority of a voice in the selection of the superiors in the Catholic Church, and pointed out the dangers to the Catholic religion which such a scheme might entail.* But it was only when Catholic emancipation became a burning question in 1791 and 1792, and when the English Cabinet feared that it should be obliged to capitulate before the agitation of the Catholic Committee, that the scheme was seriously considered. They foresaw that once the Catholics were allowed the Parliamentary franchise, and permitted to sit and vote in the House of Commons, the supreme power in Ireland must pass into Catholic hands. Hitherto, the English connection was bound up with Protestant ascendency, but, as in the new era such a weapon was useless, they determined to control the Irish Catholics by controlling their Church.

The political circumstances of the Continent favoured their project. The English government, by means of its unofficial agent, Sir John Hippisley, entered into close relations with the Holy See. The Papal States were threatened with invasion by the armies of France, and the English offered their assistance to the Pope; while, on the other hand, the use of the Papal ports for the English fleet was of immense importance. Hippisley constantly urged upon the government the advisability of profiting by this situation, by entering into official communications with the Holy See, and by securing for England the same control over Catholic affairs as was claimed by the rulers of purely Catholic countries.† The government, taking advantage of the

* *Burke's Correspondence*, Vol. IV., p. 268.
† *Memoirs of Castlereagh*, Vol. II., p. 362.

friendly relations entered into between themselves and the bishops in connection with the establishment of Maynooth College, introduced the question of episcopal elections in Ireland. Three of the bishops, O'Reilly of Armagh, Troy of Dublin, and Plunkett of Meath, submitted a series of questions to the other members of their body in February, 1795. They requested them to state what answer were they to make to the proposal of nominating the bishops by the king, and in what manner were they to advise the Pope on the matter. The bishops replied unanimously that the proposal of handing over the nomination of the bishops to the king should be resisted in *limine*, and that the Pope should be advised not to agree to such a proposal if it could be avoided, but if unavoidable, the king's nomination should be confined to one of three to be recommended by the provincial bishops.*

The reply of the bishops showed clearly that they recognised the dangerous nature of the proposal. Nevertheless, the ministers continued to press it upon their notice, more especially when the Union was determined upon. Pitt wished to embody in the Act of Union an emancipation clause, and a scheme for a state endowment of the Catholic Church in Ireland. In May, 1797, Dr. Troy of Dublin had an interview with Mr. Pelham in order to request him to contradict publicly the slanderous statement circulated by the United Irishmen that the Catholic bishops were bribed by the English government. The subject of the appointment of bishops was introduced, and Dr. Troy strongly objected either to the government being permitted to have control of the nomination or to a state endowment of the Church in Ireland. In a letter written immediately after this interview Dr. Troy stated that it was his firm belief, if ever this measure was adopted, it would be followed by the decline, and, perhaps, the destruction of religion in this country; and he expressed the fear that it had been proposed with this very intention.†

* Moran, *Spicilegium*, Vol. III., p. 474.
† *Cogan's Meath*, Vol. III., p. 213.

During the year 1798 the government continued to urge the question. The example of the bishops of Scotland, who had been most effusive in their acknowledgment of a paltry grant for the support of their church, and of Dr Douglass, who was said to have expressed his anxiety that some similar provision should be made in England, was utilised in order to overcome the scruples of the Irish bishops. The communications were carried on principally with Dr. Troy of Dublin, and Dr. Moylan of Cork. It is clear that Dr. Troy still viewed the project with suspicion, and that in his letters he brought forward serious objections against it. He urged that it might give plausible grounds for the suggestion that the Catholic clergy were dependent upon the English ministers, and that it might occasion a spirit of insubordination even amongst the clergy if they could count upon the assistance of the civil authorities as against their spiritual superiors.*

It was necessary, however, that the attitude of the Irish bishops towards the scheme should be clearly defined. The idea of incorporating an emancipation clause in the Act of Union had been abandoned owing to strong pressure from Ireland, but in its place it was decided to offer state payment of the Catholic clergy. The question was to be discussed at a meeting of the trustees of Maynooth College in January, 1799, and early in the same month Sir John Hippisley wrote to Dr. Troy urging the example of the Scotch and English prelates, and answering the objections which Dr. Troy had brought forward against the proposal.†

That the meeting of the bishops in January (17th, 18th, 19th) was not a meeting of the entire body of the bishops, but only of the trustees, is clear both from the references in the official correspondence,‡ and from the names of the prelates who signed the resolutions passed by the body. These were Drs. O'Reilly (Armagh), Troy (Dublin), Bray (Cashel), Dillon (Tuam), Plunkett

* *Castlereagh's Memoirs*, Vol. III., p. 80.
† *Idem.*, Vol. III., p. 80-93.
‡ *Idem.*, Vol. III., p. 80. Moran, Vol. III., p. 604.

(Meath), Moylan (Cork), French (Elphin), Cruise (Ardagh), Caulfield (Ferns), and Delaney (Kildare). On the other hand, it is equally clear from the same source that the subject was not sprung upon the meeting, but that some of the leading men, at least, fully understood the importance of the question to be submitted for their deliberation. In favour of state endowment and royal control it was pointed out that the Catholics of Ireland were too poor to be called upon to contribute to the support of their clergy, that emancipation could not be granted without some assurances for the future loyalty of the Catholics having been obtained, and that what was just and proper in France or Spain or Austria could not be condemned as utterly unlawful in Ireland. The government wished that the king should enjoy the same rights of patronage in Ireland as the rulers of Catholic states claimed within their respective territories, or at least, as much as the king of Prussia claimed over his Catholic subjects. The bishops did not accept such a proposal. They agreed, however, that in case of a vacancy in a diocese the diocesan clergy should recommend a candidate to the provincial bishops, that these having agreed upon a selection, the name of the candidate so selected should be presented to the government. If the government had any objection to the recommendation of the bishops such an objection was to be formulated within one month, and in this case another election should he held They added, however, that these regulations could have no force, according to the discipline of the Catholic Church, till they had been approved by the Holy See. Such approval they promised to endeavour to obtain.*

Such a concession, however important in itself, fell very far short of what the enemies of the Church demanded. Nor was it so much as had been conceded by the Pope to the rulers of other countries.† But in the special circumstances of Ireland any interference on the part of

* Moran, *Spicilegium*, Vol. III., p. 614.

† Letter of Pius VII., 1 Feb., 1816. Butler, *Historical Memoirs*, Vol. IV., pp. 536-48.

the English government with the appointment of the bishops would have been disastrous for the religious interests of the nation, and would undoubtedly have precipitated a conflict between the national and religious feelings of the people. The bishops' conditional acceptance of the proposal was due to the fact that they believed that emancipation would never be granted without some similar guarantee, and that of two evils it was necessary to choose what seemed to them at the time the lesser.

The position of affairs in Rome made it impossible to procure the approval of the Pope for these regulations. General Berthier had occupied Rome in February, 1798. Pius VI. was taken away a prisoner and died at Valence (29th Aug., 1799), and it was only in March, 1800, that a successor was elected. But Castlereagh and the Irish government declared their resolve to carry through a measure of state payment of the clergy. For this purpose they requested Dr. Troy to obtain a full report of the revenues of the bishops, parish priests and curates of the different dioceses. These reports are interesting as showing the extreme poverty of the clergy at the period.* So long as the Union question was before the country it was necessary to be conciliatory to the Catholics, but once the Union was secured, emancipation and state endowment were quickly erased from the programme of Pitt.

The English prime minister had undoubtedly led the Catholics to believe that their emancipation would immediately follow the Union. To prevent misunderstandings, Lord Cornwallis commissioned Castlereagh to proceed to England to obtain reliable assurances on this question. He was told that the Cabinet was favourable to the proposal, and that the Lord Lieutenant might use this information to secure the support of the Catholic body. These underhand communications were kept from the knowledge of Fitzgibbon and the ascendency

* They are to be found in the *Memoirs of Castlereagh*, Vol. IV., pp. 97-173.

party in Ireland. As soon, however, as the Union was carried it became necessary to adopt some definite attitude in regard to emancipation. The subject was formally discussed at a Cabinet meeting held in September, 1800, when it was found that a large body was entirely opposed to any substantial concession being given to the Catholics. On the matter having been brought under his notice George III. declared that he could never consent to Catholic emancipation, that such a step was opposed to the oath which he had taken at his coronation, and that he would consider any man who favoured it as his personal enemy. Lord Cornwallis and Castlereagh were shocked by such a manifest betrayal. Cornwallis made an earnest effort to redeem his pledges, but the influence of the Irish and English bigots was too great, and the emancipation of the Catholics was abandoned.*

Pitt resigned his office, as did also Cornwallis, Castlereagh, Grenville, Windham, Canning and some minor officials. Cornwallis urged the Catholics to accept the situation with patience, and that in the future something might be done on their behalf. The insincerity of Pitt can be proved beyond doubt. Had he been really resolved to carry the question he could easily have done so even against the wishes of the king. But instead of making an honest effort he resigned his place, and pledged himself and the majority of his friends to give a wholehearted support to the government of Addington. Three weeks later he wrote to George III., promising never again to bring forward the question of Catholic emancipation and clearly giving him to understand that if Addington resigned office, he would be willing to return upon these conditions. In 1804, when the ministry of Addington was overthrown, he returned to the helm as the declared opponent of the Catholic demands.† Lord Hardwicke came over to Ireland as Lord Lieutenant, and he took no pains to conceal his thorough contempt for the Catholics, and especially for

* *Memoirs of Lord Castlereagh*, Vol. IV., pp. 1-96.
† Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. V., pp. 428-43.

those who had favoured the Union. Such a notorious betrayal of their body ought to have been enough to warn them against ever putting any reliance in promises made to them by the English Cabinet.

In the King's speech opening Parliament in 1802 a clause was inserted declaring his resolve to uphold the constitution in Church and State. This was a hint to the Catholics and their friends that the door was closed against concession. For some time hardly anything was done. But in 1804, when Pitt returned to power, the Catholic Committee began to give signs of renewed activity, and Lord Hardwicke was instructed to point out that by petitioning for redress at that period they would only embarrass the ministry. Some of the Committee wished to keep silent, but O'Connell and Scully carried a resolution in favour of presenting a petition to Parliament. Lord Fingall, Lord French, Bellew, Scully, and Ryan were sent over to London, but Pitt, having already pledged himself not to introduce the Catholic question, refused to accept the petition. They turned then, to the Opposition. Fox presented it in the House of Commons, where it was supported by Grattan in one of his most convincing speeches, but the motion was lost by 336 to 124. In the House of Lords, where Lord Grenville championed the cause of the Catholics, only 49 supported the petition, while 179 voted against it. During the course of the debate Sir John Cox Hippisley, the former agent of the English government at Rome, intervened, and suggested certain restrictions on the publication of Papal letters in these countries, but it is not so clear that he expressly mentioned the proposed regulations regarding the election of bishops either in his actual speech * or in the pamphlet which he afterwards issued.

In 1807, the Catholic Committee, under the lead of Lord Fingall, determined to present a new petition, but Grattan having advised them that the time was not opportune, they desisted. In a letter to Grattan at this

* *Catholic Debate*, 1805, London, 1805, p. 148.

same period the Lord Lieutenant re-opened the question of an endowment for the Catholic clergy. The next year, 1808, the Catholic Committee determined to press their petition, and Lord Fingall was commissioned to proceed to London as their agent. The Irish bishops had already appointed Dr. Milner as their agent in London, and secured permission for him to be absent from his district.* Both parties interviewed Ponsonby, who was going to support their petition. He requested information about what power they were willing to concede to the king in the future election of bishops. Milner replied that he had no instructions from the Irish bishops on the point, but that he had reason to think that though they could never grant any positive power, they might be disposed to concede a negative power on episcopal nominations. After the interview Milner wrote a note explaining his own views on this point.† They would coincide fairly with the resolution passed in 1799, but in the note he emphasised the fact that he had no instructions from those for whom he was acting. The debate opened on the 25th May, 1808, when Grattan moved for a committee of the whole House to consider the petition from the Catholics of Ireland. He stated in the course of his speech that he was authorised to say "that in the future nomination of bishops his Majesty might interfere and exercise his royal privilege, and that no Catholic bishop shall be appointed without the entire approbation of his Majesty." ‡ Mr. Ponsonby went still further by asserting that if the petition were granted the Catholics would have no objection to make the king virtually head of their Church, and that any man, even though appointed by the Pope, if disapproved of by the king, should not be allowed to exercise spiritual functions. For this view he relied publicly upon Dr. Milner, the agent of the Irish bishops.§ Lord Grenville adopted the same line of argument in the House of

* Moran, *Spicilegium*, Vol. III., p. 538.
† *Supplementary Memoirs*, pp. 121-7.
‡ *Grattan's Memoirs*, Vol. V., p. 377.
§ *Butler's Historical Memoirs*, Vol. IV., pp. 143-45.

Lords; but, fortunately, the motion in favour of the Catholics was rejected by large majorities in both Houses.

Dr. Milner issued a protest against the use that had been made of his name in the debates. Ponsonby had undoubtedly gone further than Milner's written statement warranted, and when the report of the debates reached Ireland it aroused universal indignation. Dr. Milner was sharply reproved by a number of the Irish bishops,* and in reply he wrote the pamphlet, *Letter to an Irish Priest,* in which he advocated a negative veto on the episcopal appointments. The pamphlet was written merely for private circulation, and was not, according to Milner's own statement, an expression of his personal views on the question of the veto. About the opinion of Irish Catholics on the veto no possible doubt could exist. Public opinion declared itself strongly against any such proposal.

A meeting of the bishops was summoned for September, 1808, and it was agreed, with only three dissentients, "that it was inexpedient to introduce any alteration in the canonical mode hitherto observed in the nomination of Roman Catholic bishops," but that the bishops would pledge themselves to recommend for appointment only such persons as are of unimpeached loyalty and peaceable conduct.† The people ardently supported the resolutions of the bishops as was evident from the number of addresses of thanks voted to them in the leading centres of the country, while, on the other hand, the friends of Lord Fingall met with hardly any support. In England, however, the Catholic Board, which had been established, favoured the veto proposals. In 1810, representatives of this body had an interview with Lord Gray and Lord Grenville. It was agreed that while no specific reference should be made to the restrictions on episcopal appointments, assurances should be given for the loyalty of the Catholics. A resolution to

* *Supplementary Memoirs*, p. 128.
† *Butler's Historical Memoirs*, Vol. IV., p. 161.

that effect was drawn up and passed at a great meeting of the English Catholics, lay and cleric, held in London in February, 1810. This resolution was afterwards known as the "Fifth Resolution," and was accepted by the English vicars apostolic, with the sole exception of Dr. Milner. The Irish bishops met in Dublin on the 24th February, 1810. They renewed their adherence to their resolutions of September, 1808, declared that the oath of allegiance was a sufficient guarantee of their loyalty, that a continuation of the practice hitherto observed in the appointment of Irish Catholic prelates could not tend to produce an undue or mischievous exercise of any foreign influence, that they neither sought nor desired any other earthly consideration for their spiritual ministry save what their people from a sense of religion and duty voluntarily paid them, and that an address explanatory of their sentiments be prepared and directed to the clergy and laity of Ireland.* The General Catholic Committee in Dublin strongly supported the action of the bishops. At a meeting held in March, 1810, with Lord French in the chair, a resolution of thanks was unanimously voted to the bishops. A petition was drawn up by the Catholic Committee and was entrusted to Grattan. In May, 1810, he moved that the petition should be referred to a committee of the whole House. He did not apparently advocate the veto proposals, but he was strong on insisting upon some securities against French influence in the nomination of the bishops. Ponsonby explained at length the nature of the proposals made to him by Dr. Milner in 1808, and endeavoured to show that in speaking as he did he was acting in strict conformity with the instructions he had received from Dr. Milner. Grattan's resolution was lost by a majority of 104.†

In Ireland the veto question had succeeded in dividing the Catholic forces. The bishops and clergy and vast majority of the people were opposed to every interfer-

* *Milner's Supplementary Memoirs*, p. 168.
† *Grattan's Memoirs*, Vol. V., p. 411.

ence. In the Catholic Committee the majority followed O'Connell in his determined resistance to the veto, but a minority, composed for the most part of the aristocracy, was in constant communication with the English Catholic Board. In 1811, the government, taking advantage of this division, and of some imprudent steps which had been taken, suppressed the Committee, but it was speedily reconstituted under another name. The division, however, unfortunately continued, and both bodies claimed to speak in the name of the Catholics of Ireland. In 1812, a motion in favour of Catholic Relief was proposed by Canning, and was carried in the House of Commons by a large majority, but it was defeated in the House of Lords.

Many people on both sides were anxious to put an end to the quarrel between the different sections of the Catholics. The bishops commissioned Dr. Moylan to proceed to England, and to interview the English vicars apostolic in order to bring about a reconciliation. The treatment of the French exiled ecclesiastics who refused to submit to the Pope's instructions, and the celebrated "Fifth Resolution" were the main subjects of disagreement. At a meeting of the vicars, held at Durham in 1812, Dr. Moylan attended, and his views were strongly supported by Dr. Milner, but the others were unwilling to come to terms, and the plans for reconciliation failed.

Meanwhile, the English Catholic Board, and the small group of Irish Catholics who acted in conjunction with them, were busy at work arranging with Canning, Grattan and their other prominent supporters, the terms of a new Relief Bill to be submitted to Parliament in the following year. Plunkett, Burrowes, Burton and Wallace assisted Grattan in the preparation of the measure. In February, 1813, Grattan moved that the House should resolve itself into a committee to consider the state of the laws affecting his Majesty's Catholic subjects. The resolution was carried by a large majority, and on the 12th April Grattan introduced his bill. As brought in by Grattan it removed all restrictions except

in regard to the offices of Lord Lieutenant and Lord Chancellor. The second reading was carried in May by a majority of 42.*

But the English Protestants were still determined to secure some guarantee for the loyalty of the Catholics. Canning and his friends entered into communication with the English Catholic Board, and two clauses were drawn up, which should be proposed for insertion in Grattan's Relief Bill. Grattan and Ponsonby, understanding that without such an amendment the measure could not be passed, accepted them.†

By these clauses it was provided that a certain number of lay commissioners, who should be Catholics, peers and owners of a freehold estate of one thousand a year, should be appointed. They were to take an oath to discharge their duties faithfully, and to maintain secrecy in regard to their proceedings. To this body every ecclesiastic elected to a Catholic bishopric in England or Scotland should notify his election, and the commissioners were to transmit the name to the Privy Council with a certificate of loyalty, unless, indeed, they had reasons for refusing such a certificate. Any person who had obtained such a certificate might exercise episcopal functions in England or Scotland; but if any person dared to do so without such a certificate he was to be considered guilty of a misdemeanour, and liable to be expelled from the kingdom. A body of commissioners of the same kind, and with similar powers, was to be established for Ireland.

Furthermore, it was provided that these same bodies, with the addition of some Protestant official, and the archbishops of Armagh and Dublin, in case of the Irish commissioners, should examine all papal documents coming into Ireland or Great Britain. Every person receiving such a document should be obliged to forward a copy to the commissioners within six weeks, or to certify to them in writing that it referred only to spiritual

* Amherst, *Catholic Emancipation*, Vol. II., p. 99.
† *Grattan's Memoirs*, Vol. V., p. 493.

matters, and did not affect the allegiance due to his Majesty or the civil rights of any of his Majesty's subjects. Any person fulfilling these conditions was to be exempted from all pains and penalties, but otherwise he was to be adjudged guilty of misdemeanour, and was liable to be expelled from the kingdom.

Dr. Milner, the agent of the Irish bishops, actively opposed these clauses, but failed to secure the assistance of any of the English vicars. On the 21st May he published a pamphlet, under the title of the *Brief Memorial*, in which he vigorously criticised the proposals of Canning, and declared that the Catholics could never accept emancipation on such conditions. The pamphlet, showing as it did that a large body of the Catholics would not be satisfied by Grattan's bill, even were it to become law, decided the fate of the measure. In the discussions in committee, an amendment was proposed by Abbot in favour of excluding the Catholics from sitting in Parliament, and the motion having been carried by a majority of four, the friends of the bill determined not to proceed further. The select committee of the English Catholic Board met, and promptly expelled Milner from their body as a mark of their disapprobation of his conduct. On the other hand, the Irish bishops met in May, 1813, and thanked Milner for his services, while a similar resolution was passed at a general meeting of the Catholic laymen in Dublin.*

A meeting of the English vicars was held at Durham in October, 1813, at which Milner was not present. They agreed to support the "Fifth Resolution." Negotiations, too, were opened by the English Catholic Board and their supporters with Rome, and Mgr. Quarantotti called upon Milner to justify the attitude he had adopted. The Irish bishops felt called upon to defend their agent. At a meeting held in November, 1813, they addressed a strong letter to Rome in justification of Milner. The letter was signed by all the Irish bishops. But the agents of the English Catholic Board, notably Dr.

* *Supplementary Memoirs*, pp. 212-13.

MacPherson, rector of the Scotch College, spared no pains to show that the stubborn attitude adopted by Milner and the Irish Catholics was likely to endanger the chances of emancipation, and that the securities proposed were of no serious importance to the future of the Catholic religion in Great Britain or Ireland. Pius VII. was at that time a prisoner at Fontainebleau, and the cardinals were scattered through France. Mgr. Quarantotti, acting-secretary to the Propaganda, undertook to settle the dispute. He forwarded a rescript to Dr. Poynter (Feb., 1814), in which he undertook to state the concessions which Catholics might make in return for emancipation. Mgr. Quarantotti expressed almost complete approval of the attitude of those who had been willing to accept the bill of 1813, even as amended by the Canning clauses. He declared that Catholics might accept such a measure with safety, that they might take the oath of allegiance proposed, that the proposed royal veto on episcopal appointments, and the royal *Placet* on Papal documents in so far as it aimed merely at the exclusion of political matters, might be conceded.*

The publication of this rescript roused all parties to more active opposition. The letters of many of the bishops in reply to Dr. Poynter showed that the approval of Mgr. Quarantotti had not affected their opinions in regard to the veto. A large body of the Dublin clergy met in Bridge Street chapel (12th May, 1814), and declared the rescript non-obligatory. They declared their determination to resist the veto proposals in whatever form they might be put forward, and called upon the bishops to represent to Pius VII., then returned to Rome, the dangerous consequences which would flow from any such concessions. The example of the Dublin clergy was followed in most of the other dioceses in Ireland. Dr. Lanigan and other well-known ecclesiastics attacked the rescript in the public journals, and showed that Mgr. Quarantotti, in issuing

* Brück, *Irische Veto*, pp. 71-3.

such a document, had far exceeded his powers.* The resolutions of the Irish Catholic Board and of the laymen generally were equally strong.

In May, 1814, the Irish bishops met at Maynooth, and unanimously declared that the rescript was not obligatory, and resolved that for the purpose of placing the true state of affairs before the Pope, Drs. Milner and Murray, the coadjutor archbishop of Dublin, should be commissioned to go to Rome as the representatives of the Irish bishops. Milner had already gone to Rome at the beginning of the month, and Dr. Murray followed him thither. Their opponents, too, strained every nerve to secure the approval of the Pope. Pius VII. received the agents of the Irish bishops very graciously, and referred them to Cardinal Litta, lately appointed prefect of the Propaganda. The political circumstances of Europe favoured the designs of the English Catholic Board. Consalvi, who, while in England, seemed to have expressed strong views against the veto, was dependent largely upon the support of Castlereagh and England at the Congress of Vienna. Besides, the escape of Napoleon from Elba, and the threatening attitude adopted by Murat, obliged Pius VII. to leave the capital of his states and seek a refuge in Genoa, where he could rely upon the protection of the English fleet. In consequence of the dependence upon England, and of the friendly dispositions of England towards the restoration of the Papal States, the friends of the veto had an excellent opportunity of securing what they represented to the Pope as a necessary concession for obtaining complete emancipation.

The Pope's answer was forwarded by Cardinal Litta to Dr. Poynter, vicar apostolic of the London district (26th April, 1815). The cardinal announced that the Pope did not wish to give a final decision on the question submitted, but that he merely wished to state the conditions which the Catholics might accept in order to secure emancipation. First, he allowed them to take any

* Fitzpatrick, *Wits and Worthies of the Irish Church*, Dublin, 1873, p. 159 *sqq.*

one of three forms of oaths of allegiance submitted for examination; second, the Catholics might allow a list of the candidates proposed for vacant bishoprics to be presented to the king's ministers, who might strike off the names of obnoxious or suspected clerics, provided, however, that a sufficient number were left to allow his Holiness to choose the individuals whom he deemed most qualified for governing the vacant churches. The royal *Placet* on Papal documents could not, however, be admitted under any form.*

This letter, which was indirectly a severe condemnation of Mgr. Quarantotti's rescript, and which merely stated the concessions which Catholics might make in order to secure emancipation, was hailed by the vetoists as a complete victory for their party. In Ireland, however, it met with violent opposition. Its contents were kept a secret for some time, but ugly rumours began to spread abroad, and petitions poured in on the bishops from all quarters asking them to safeguard the interests of religion. In August, 1815, the Irish bishops assembled to deliberate on the form of reply that should be forwarded to Rome. Dr. Murray had returned to Ireland in February, 1815, and Dr. Milner to London in June. Dr. Milner wrote to some of the bishops, exhorting them to accept the terms laid down in Cardinal Litta's letter. But the bishops, well aware of the state of feeling in the country, refused to follow this advice. They declared that it was their conscientious conviction that any power granted to the English government of interfering directly or indirectly in the appointment of Catholic bishops in Ireland must eventually injure, and possibly subvert, the Catholic religion in the country, and that with such a conviction they should be regarded as traitors did they not oppose such proposals in every canonical and constitutional way. They pointed out, too, that however great might be their reverence and respect for the Supreme Pontiff, their fears could not be laid to rest by any determination of his Holiness, arrived

* Butler, Vol. IV., 529 *sqq*.

at not only without their concurrence, but in opposition to their repeated resolutions, and that Dr. Murray, their representative, was more competent to give correct information about the true state of affairs than those who were said to have been consulted in the preparation of the letter. They commissioned Dr. Murray, Coadjutor of Dublin, and Dr. Murphy, of Cork, to lay their resolutions before the Pope. Twenty-eight bishops attached their signatures to this document.* A few days later a general meeting of the lay Catholics was held in Dublin. The bishops were thanked for the manly stand they had taken, and three representatives, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Owen O'Connor, and the Irish Franciscan, Father Hayes, were appointed to proceed to Rome as the envoys of the Catholics of Ireland. The two lay gentlemen afterwards declined, but Father Hayes accepted the commission, and reached Rome two days after the arrival of the episcopal representatives (25th Oct., 1815).

In Rome it was well known that there existed a division of opinion. Cardinal Consalvi, mindful of his diplomatic victories won by the assistance of England, strongly favoured the veto, while Cardinal Litta, the Prefect of the Propaganda, well aware of the injury to religion likely to result from such a measure, was on the side of the Irish bishops. Were the case left to the decision of the Propaganda there could be little doubt that the decision would be favourable, while, on the other hand, if it were submitted to a congregation in which the Secretary of State had any control, the issue was extremely doubtful. The bishops and Father Hayes took no pains to conceal their distrust of Consalvi, and as no reply was made to their urgent demands for a trial, the bishops demanded their passports (5th Jan., 1816), and left Rome. In February, 1816, Pius VII. addressed a letter to the Irish bishops, which was meant as a reply to the representations of their agents. It was written in a kindly tone, though the Pope did not conceal his pain at the strong terms of the resolutions passed by the

* Butler, Vol. IV., p. 174. Renehan, Vol. I., p. 384.

bishops at their previous meeting. He pointed out that in making the concessions which he made, he had acted in strict conformity with the principles laid down by his predecessors in such matters, that the fears of the bishops were groundless, and that even though the government did its worst, the veto on episcopal appointments proposed by him could not be utilised for the injury and destruction of religion.*

The letter of Pius VII. did not put an end to the controversy. The Catholic Board declared that Catholics would never accept emancipation on such conditions, and Dr. Murray, of Dublin, in a sermon preached on Good Friday, 1816, denounced in strong language the conduct of those who would bind the Church in fetters as Christ was bound by the Jews of old. In July, 1817, the members of the Catholic Board forwarded a strongly-worded remonstrance to Rome, in which they protested against the veto in every form, complained of the delay in answering the demands of their representative, and requested that the decision should be given with as little delay as possible. Father Hayes had been active in Rome, but his prudence was not in proportion to his activity. Annoyed by the continued delays and by the unfriendly attitude of Cardinal Consalvi, he bitterly attacked the Secretary of State both in his personal interviews with the Pope and in the documents that he presented. Finally, he was requested to leave the Papal States within eight days, and, as he refused to do so, he was conveyed across the borders into Tuscan territory. On his return to Dublin he gave a detailed account of his mission to a meeting of the Catholic Association in Dublin, 18th December, 1817. In February, 1818, the Pope addressed a letter to the Catholic Board. In it he recounted once more the grounds which moved him to permit the acceptance of the veto proposals, and strongly reproved the conduct of Father Hayes, both during his stay in Rome and on his return to Ireland. Father Hayes gracefully submitted to this reproof, and refused to allow his name to be used

* Butler, Vol. IV., pp. 536 *sqq.*

further in the dispute. From this time forward, though the question was not allowed to rest, the controversy lost much of its bitterness, and the leading Catholics began to realise that the divisions in their own body must be healed before emancipation could be won.

From 1813 the Catholic claims in Parliament began to lose ground. This was largely due to the dissensions in the Catholic ranks and to the spirit of hopelessness which such divisions entailed. The aristocratic section of the Irish Catholics who favoured the veto were in open opposition to the majority of their co-religionists. The attitude of Grattan towards the Canning clauses was severely criticised by the Catholic Board, while, on the other hand, it was highly praised by Lord Trimleston and his friends. In 1816, the Catholic Board entrusted their petition to Sir Henry Parnell, while the other section put forward Grattan as their spokesman. Their petitions were, however, rejected by a large majority. The next year their petitions met with no better fate. In 1819, Grattan brought forward the Catholic question once more. It was his last effort in Parliament. Though his health was seriously impaired, he travelled to London that he might make another appeal on behalf of his Catholic countrymen. His effort was, however, unavailing, but the majority against him was only two. The following year Grattan received a deputation from the Catholic Board, and announced his intention of attending in Parliament to support their petition. Knowing the serious condition of his health, they endeavoured to persuade him against such a step, but he adhered to his resolution and set out for London. He reached the city completely worn out, and died without being able to take his seat in Parliament (4th June, 1820).* By his death the Catholics of Ireland had lost their most steadfast friend.

The Catholic Committee in Dublin had gradually lost its influence during the early years of the nineteenth century, partly owing to the general tone of despondency prevalent amongst the Catholic body, and partly owing to the personal jealousies of the aspirants to the leader-

* *Grattan's Memoirs*, Vol. V., Chap. XV.

ship. The veto controversy helped to complete the work of dissolution. It renewed in great part the old divisions between the aristocratic and the democratic sections, and by dividing them, weakened the power of both to secure any ameliorations. Twice, in 1811 and 1814, the government made a determined effort to suppress it completely, but by a few slight changes the provisions of the Convention Act were evaded, and the Committee went on almost as before. In place of the old leaders a young Catholic lawyer had arisen in the person of Daniel O'Connell, who both from his education and natural temperament seemed specially fitted to lead the Irish Catholics to victory. Daniel O'Connell was born in Kerry in 1775, and received the greater part of his early education at St. Omer. On his return to Ireland in 1793 he devoted himself to the study of law, and was called to the Bar in 1798. His experiences of revolution determined him to avoid secret societies, and to stake his chances of success on constitutional agitation. Soon the young lawyer won for himself a commanding position in the Catholic Committee. When the older leaders were inclined to keep quiet in order not to embarrass the government, O'Connell boldly advocated a more manly policy, and succeeded in winning the support of the body for his plans. During the agitation on the veto question, though his views were at times gravely suspected, he was in general a strong opponent of vetoism, and his harangues at the Dublin meetings helped to rouse the country to a keener appreciation of the dangers which the measure entailed. He grew tired, however, of dissension, and was anxious to bury the hatchet in order that all sections might rally once more in favour of their main object, namely, Catholic emancipation.

The fate of Plunkett's Relief Bill in 1821, and the disappointment which followed the glowing hopes that had been raised by the visit of George IV. to Ireland in the same year, helped to disillusionise a large body of the leading Catholics in Ireland. O'Connell and Sheil, who had been in different camps during the veto struggle, came together in 1823, and issued an address to the lead-

ing members of the Catholic body in favour of establishing a Catholic Association.* At first very few responded to their appeal, but notwithstanding the rebuffs received they determined to hold together in hopes of a better day. It was difficult to evade the provisions of the Convention Act, but O'Connell succeeded by establishing the Association on the model of an open club, where new members were admitted on the proposition of a friend and the payment of an annual fee of one pound. For some time it was difficult to secure even a quorum of members for the transaction of the routine business, but gradually the different parties began to rally to its support, till finally it succeeded in bringing together representatives of all sections of the Catholic people.

The work of spreading the Association through the country was not so easy of attainment, but the enthusiastic support of the clergy, especially of the younger generation of priests, overcame the difficulties, and branches of the association began to be established in the provinces. O'Connell had long foreseen that the masses of the people, possessing, as they did, the right of suffrage, might prove most powerful allies in his campaign if only they could be aroused to a proper sense of their own power. To give them an interest in the work of the Association, and, at the same time, to provide funds for the numerous works undertaken by the body, he carried the plan of imposing a Catholic Rent (4th Feb., 1824). All Catholics, no matter how poor, were invited to pay at least a penny a month to the funds of the Association. The plan was not a new one. It had been proposed at an earlier period in Ireland, but never before in such a practical and taking form. The plan of the Catholic rent was taken up with enthusiasm. The towns took the lead, and the country parishes soon followed suit. In October, 1824, the weekly contribution amounted to £350, but this was soon doubled. The collections were made in most cases at the doors of the Catholic Church; the weekly reports from the Dublin body were read to the members, and in this way the

* Wyse, *Catholic Association*, Vol. I., Chap. VII.

peasantry in the most remote parts of Ireland were gradually brought under the influence of the central association, and were being trained to look there for the word of command.

The government began to grow alarmed at the progress of events in Ireland. A Parliamentary Committee was established to report on the state of Ireland. Many of the leading Catholic bishops, Drs. Curtis (Armagh), Murray (Dublin), O'Kelly (Tuam), and Doyle, of Kildare, were summoned to London to give evidence (March, 1825). They were closely questioned upon all points of Catholic doctrine, and their replies went a good way to remove many of the old prejudices against their religion. Dr. Doyle, who had already by his letters done much to enlighten public opinion on such topics, was the leading figure at the Commission. Nothing could exceed the knowledge, readiness, and skill displayed by him while under examination. The friends of the government had already determined to take steps for the suppression of the Catholic Association, but at the same time hopes were held out that the suppression would be speedily followed by a Relief Bill. In February, 1825, Goulbourn introduced a bill prohibiting societies established for the redress of grievances in Church or State to hold meetings of more than fourteen days' duration, to collect money, or to appoint permanent executive committees. Though the Catholic Association was not mentioned, everybody knew that it was principally aimed at, and the Association demanded to be heard at the bar of the House in its own defence. The request was, however, refused, but at the same time O'Connell was partly consoled by the promise of a speedy passage for the Relief Bill, of which Sir Francis Burdett had given notice. There was no intention of granting the Catholics relief without securing some guarantees for their future conduct; and, hence, two "wings" were added to the Relief Bill, providing for the state payment of the clergy and the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders. These precautionary measures were suggested by some of the evidence taken before the Parliamentary Commission. O'Connell

and his friends were more or less induced to give their consent to these clauses, but even with them the bigotry of the House of Lords could not be overcome, and the bill was rejected. The Duke of York, heir presumptive to the throne, made himself conspicuous by his opposition to the measure, much to the delight of the ascendency party in Ireland.

O'Connell returned to face the difficult situation that confronted him in Ireland. The Association was suppressed, the Relief Bill had been lost, and, to make matters worse, he was blamed by his own supporters for having betrayed their interests in consenting to the payment of the clergy and the disfranchisement of such a large body of Catholic voters. But O'Connell rose to the occasion. He pledged himself to resist state payment of the clergy, and, having secured the confidence of his supporters, proceeded to re-constitute the Catholic Association in such a way as to evade the terms of the recent law. It was set up as a society for the promotion of education, charity, agriculture and social amusement. The Catholic Rent was continued, though ostensibly for another purpose. The law permitted meetings which did not exceed the duration of fourteen days; and, hence, provincial meetings were speedily organised in all parts of Ireland. By means of these the leading Catholic men began to be acquainted with one another; closer bonds of union were established, and the whole country came more into touch with the leaders of the movement. Many of the leading Protestants joined hands with the Catholics; but the vast majority of their body became more determined to resist every concession to the Catholics.

O'Connell, having secured the co-operation of the masses of the people, bethought himself of the advantage which might be derived from their possession of the Parliamentary suffrage. A vacancy having occurred in Waterford, it was determined to oppose the candidature of Lord George Beresford, and Villiers Stuart, a popular young Protestant gentleman, and an ardent supporter of emancipation, was selected as the candidate

of the Association (1826). The constituency had been always regarded as the possession of the Beresford family, and the landlord party was at first amused at the idea of an Association candidate opposing one of the most powerful of its body. But they had mistaken the temper of the country and the influence of the clergy who rallied almost unanimously to the side of Stuart. The family of the Marquis of Waterford was deserted even by its own tenants. The peasantry for the first time showed that they had a mind of their own, and that their votes could not be disposed of by the lords of the soil. O'Connell and his friends met with an enthusiastic reception in the district and at the hustings. The voters polled steadily in favour of Stuart, and, after five days, Lord George Beresford admitted his defeat by retiring from the contest. The example of Waterford was followed in Louth, Monaghan, and Westmeath.

The landlords showed their resentment by wholesale evictions, but the Association raised funds to support those who had suffered. Instead of the individual petitions that had been usual till this period, it was resolved that on a certain Sunday the Catholics should meet in every parish and adopt a form of resolution that had been sent down from Dublin. The object of this move was to give a clear proof of the perfection of the organisation, and to show that if the necessity should arise the whole Catholic body could be promptly moved as one man. The movement in Ireland began to attract attention abroad. The French papers gave long accounts of the work of the Catholic Association, and these accounts were copied into the Catholic press in Bavaria, Italy and Spain. The Irish emigrants in the United States took steps to show their interest in the struggle that was being waged at home.

The ascendency party in Ireland began to get alarmed at the course of events. In imitation of the Association clubs they began to organise Brunswick clubs wherever they could count upon any support. Alarming rumours were circulated by means of the English press, and Ireland was depicted as being in a

state bordering upon revolution. The government was at first inclined to treat the agitation with contempt. A motion in favour of the Catholics was rejected in March, 1827. Canning, the supporter of Catholic emancipation, succeeded Lord Liverpool as Prime Minister in April, but his death after a few months in office put an end to all hopes of a speedy settlement. Lord Goderich took in hands the formation of a Cabinet, but in January, 1828, his ministry ceased.

The Duke of Wellington became Premier, with Peel as leader of the House of Commons. A few of Canning's supporters took office, and the Catholic emancipation was supposed to be an open question, but Canning's friends soon parted company from their leaders to the great relief of Wellington and Peel. Peel was opposed to Catholic emancipation on the ground that it was sure to lead to separation, and was ready to try conclusions with O'Connell and the Association, but the House of Commons showed no willingness to embark in such an enterprise. On acccount of the changes caused by the retirement of Canning's friends, the Board of Trade became vacant, and the place was offered to Vesey Fitzgerald, one of the representatives of Clare. He accepted, and was therefore obliged to seek re-election.

The Catholic Association had pledged itself to oppose the administration of the Duke of Wellington so long as it remained hostile to their claims. When the vacancy occurred in Clare they were obliged to take action, though on account of the fact that Vesey Fitzgerald had been a steady supporter of Catholic emancipation, many members of the Association thought that an exception should be made in his favour. The majority, however, declared against him, and it was determined to set up a rival candidate, if any suitable person could be found. Several Protestant gentlemen were invited to stand, but for one reason or another declined the invitation. Finally, O'Connell himself resolved to take the field, and issued an address to the electors of Clare. The issues were now knit. O'Connell and Catholic Ireland

were pitted against Wellington, Peel, and the whole party of ascendency. It was felt in some mysterious way that if only O'Connell could be returned the cause of emancipation was secure.

Both parties concentrated their forces in the constituency. The Association sent down its ablest speakers, Catholic and Protestant, lay and cleric. Money poured in from all quarters to help O'Connell in the struggle. Within a week £28,000 were subscribed to meet the expenses of the election. The people of Clare responded generously to their leaders. They were proud of the confidence shown in them by O'Connell, and they were determined to risk the vengeance of their landlords by striking a blow for Catholic emancipation. They rallied to the side of O'Connell, and Fitzgerald, seeing that the case was hopeless, retired from the contest before the polling was completed. Objections were made to the return of O'Connell, but the sheriff refused to admit them at that stage, and O'Connell was declared the Parliamentary representative for Clare.

Feeling in the country was now intense. Both parties proclaimed themselves ready for a final struggle, but O'Connell and Sheil were determined to restrain the ardour of their friends, and to prevent civil war. The Catholic rent was increased to £2,704 the week after the Clare election. It was determined to utilise the funds to contest every constituency in Ireland which was held by an enemy of Catholic emancipation. Immense meetings were held in Tipperary with the nominal object of putting an end to the faction fights which had disgraced that portion of the country, but in reality to frighten the government. In Monaghan a conflict between the Catholics and the Orangemen at Ballybay was prevented only by the earnest exertions of General Thornton. For the time the exertions of O'Connell and Sheil were sufficient to keep their party in restraint, but no man could say when an ugly conflict might arise.

The ministers in England were thoroughly alarmed at the progress of events in Ireland. They were face to

face with civil war or emancipation, and for a time they seemed unable to make a selection. In August, 1828, Dawson, a brother-in-law of Peel, assured his friends at Derry that the claims of the Catholics could be resisted no longer. Dr. Curtis of Armagh, who had been acquainted previously with the Duke of Wellington in Spain, wrote to him entreating him to yield, and the Duke replied that if only the Catholics were content to wait he hoped to be able to meet their wishes. The archbishop asked the Lord Lieutenant, the Marquis of Anglesey, to interpret this letter, and the Marquis in his reply gave him to understand that emancipation was certain to be granted. The contents of this letter were made public, and created so much consternation in the ascendency camp that the Marquis was recalled.

But the Duke of Wellington and Peel were agreed that emancipation could not be postponed. Their chief difficulty was the resistance of George IV., who wished to maintain the principles of his father. The repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts in April, 1828, by which the Dissenters were admitted to full political privileges, had already overturned the old theory that the political power in the state must be vested in the members of the state Church. The ministers represented to the king that emancipation was an absolute necessity, and that no other course remained except to yield. The Duke of Wellington and Peel undertook the preparation of a bill to be presented to Parliament in 1829. The old veto clauses were abandoned because it was well known that the Irish Catholics would not accept emancipation at such a price. The payment of the clergy was, however, part of the original scheme, and it was only at the last moment that it was omitted in deference to the wishes of the English Protestants.

In the king's speech at the opening of the Parliamentary session (5th Feb., 1829) it was announced that a bill would be submitted for the suppression of the Catholic Association, and that subsequently the laws affecting Roman Catholics in Great Britain and Ireland must be taken into consideration. The first measure was passed

without serious difficulty, and the Association, much against the will of O'Connell, dissolved itself. As the day approached for the introduction of the emancipation bill the king became more determined in his opposition, and it was only when he was presented with the resignation of the Cabinet that he overcame his scruples and allowed the ministers to proceed. The measure was introduced in the House of Commons by Sir Robert Peel. He frankly confessed that he disliked emancipation, but that owing to the circumstances of the time, the strength of the Catholic organisation, and the division of opinion existing among Protestants, he was prepared to sacrifice his own principles for the sake of the nation. Petitions poured in from many quarters against the proposed relief, but without effect. The third reading was carried (30th March) by a majority of 188. The bill passed through the House of Lords, and on the 13th April, 1829, received the royal assent.

The Emancipation Act removed many of the glaring inequalities of which Catholics complained. They were permitted to sit and vote in the House of Commons and House of Lords, to become members of corporations, to hold any civil office except that of regent of the United Kingdom, of Lord Chancellor, lord keeper of the great seal of Great Britain and Ireland, or of viceroy of Ireland. The old oaths, framed specially for the exclusion of Catholics, were either abolished or radically changed. But, on the other hand, the forty-shilling freeholders, by whose assistance O'Connell had been enabled to dictate terms to the Cabinet, were disfranchised. So long as these men were content to vote according to the wishes of the landlords they were the bulwark of the state, but once they had shown that they intended to be freemen they were denounced as the ignorant dupes of the clergy and the agitators, and their disfranchisement was urged as an absolute necessity for the public weal. Severe regulations were also inserted in regard to the Jesuits and other religious orders or congregations. Those resident in the country at the time of the passing of the act were obliged to register them-

selves, while any others coming in afterwards, or taking the vows of such orders or congregations, were liable to be banished from the kingdom for life. Furthermore, it was provided that if any Catholic ecclesiastic, whether secular or regular, should exercise any of the rites and ceremonies of his religion, and wear the habit of his order save within the usual places of worship, or in private houses, he was liable to a fine of £50.* As O'Connell pointed out at the time, it was nearly impossible for a private individual to enforce these penal statutes against the religious orders, and there was no likelihood that the government would undertake a prosecution. The clauses were intended merely as an offering to placate the bigotry of opponents. The clergy of Dublin diocese presented a strong petition against the insertion of the clauses directed against members of religious orders or congregations.† Finally, as if to wound the feelings of the entire Catholic body, it was decided that O'Connell should be obliged to take the oaths in force at the time of his election. Naturally, he refused to do so; and a new writ was issued for Clare, where he was re-elected with enthusiasm.

The question of emancipation having been settled, there was less difficulty in determining the method of conducting episcopal elections in Ireland. By a decree of the congregation of the Propaganda, issued on the 1st June, 1829, it was arranged that wherever a see should become vacant a vicar capitular should be appointed, and the metropolitan should direct him immediately to convoke the canons and the parish priests for an election The election should be held on the twentieth day after the date on which the metropolitan issued his letter, and the vicar capitular should summon the meeting within eight days after the reception of this document. The names of the three candidates who received the largest number of votes were to be submitted to a meeting of the bishops of the province, and the Congregation of the Propaganda in Rome, having received the

*' *The Statutes Revised*, Vol. IV., pp. 878-83.
† Meagher, *Life of Archbishop Murray*, pp. 86-88.

results both of the election of the priests and of the deliberations of the bishops, was to advise the Pope finally in regard to the appointment. By a subsequent decree (April, 1835) it was pointed out that the names of the three persons recommended should be selected by one single scrutiny, not by three different scrutinies as had been sometimes done.*

(*c*) From Emancipation till the Disestablishment (1829-1870).

O'Brien, *Fifty Years of Concessions to Ireland*, 2 vols., London, 1883-85. Perraud, *Études sur l'Irlande Contemporaine*, 2 vols., Paris, 1862 (trans., Dublin, 1863). Lecky, *Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland*, 2 vols., London, 1903. Bryce, *Two Centuries of Irish History* (1691-1870), London, 1888. MacDonagh, *Life of O'Connell*, London, 1903. Duffy, *Four Years of Irish History*, Dublin, 1883; *The League of the North and South*, Dublin, 1886; *My Life in Two Hemispheres*, 2 vols., Dublin, 1869. O'Brien, *Dublin Castle and the Irish People*, London, 1909. Dubois, *Contemporary Ireland*, Dublin, 1908. Meagher, *Notices of the Life and Character of Archbishop Murray*, Dublin, 1853. Crolly, *Life of Dr. Crolly, Archbishop of Armagh*, Dublin, 1851. Cusack, *Life of Dr. Dixon*, London, 1878. Moran, *Pastoral Letters and Other Writings of Cardinal Cullen*, Dublin, 1862. Reilly, *Life of Dr. MacHale*, 2 vols., New York, 1896. *Allocutions and Pastorals of Dr. Moriarty*, Dublin, 1884. Lucas, *Life of Frederick Lucas*, 2 vols., London, 1886. Ball, *The Reformed Church in Ireland* (1537-1886), London, 1886. Killen, *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, 2 vols., London, 1875. Godkin, *Ireland and Her Churches*, London, 1867. Parker, *Papers of Sir Robert Peel*, 3 vols., London, 1899. Walpole, *Life of Lord John Russell*, 2 vols., London 1899. *The Greville Memoirs*, London, 1885-87. Morley, *Life of Gladstone*, 3 vols., London, 1903. Cogan, *The Diocese of Meath*, 3 vols., Dublin, 1862-70. Comerford, *Collections relating to the Dioceses of Kildare and Leighlin*, 3 vols., Dublin, 1884. Stuart-Coleman, *Historical Memoirs of the City of Armagh*, Dublin, 1900, Carrigan, *History and Antiquities of the Diocese of Ossory*, 4 vols., Dublin, 1905. Monahan, *Records relating to the Diocese of Ardagh*, Dublin, 1886. Fahy, *The History and Antiquities of the Diocese of Kilmacduagh*, Dublin, 1893. *Irish Catholic Directory*, Dublin, 1836-1909.

The long struggle for Catholic emancipation was not without its effects on the country. Members of the Established Church, who had strongly resisted all concessions to Catholics had begun to adopt a new style of

* Appendix, *Synod Plen. Epis. Hibern.*, 1900, pp. 140-45.

warfare, which tended to rouse the religious feelings of the people. The Bible Society that had been established in 1804 spread its branches into different parts of the country, and by means of the schools and popular missions it was determined to save the Irish Catholics by inducing them to read the pure word of God. In 1822, the "Scripture Readers' Society" was instituted to further this campaign. So utterly objectionable were the means adopted by the new preachers that most of the Protestant bishops refused to lend their assistance, and some of them went so far as to prohibit their clergy from attending the meetings.*

By means of the schools, the bible societies, and the itinerant preachers it was thought that the Irish people could be won over from the practice of their religion. The "New Reformation" movement began to attract attention on all sides. The new preachers in many cases challenged their opponents to a public religious discussion. These challenges were frequently accepted by both priests and laymen, and in Carlow, Galway, Derry, Downpatrick, Dublin, public discussions took place between the Catholics and the new ministers of the gospel. The most remarkable of these discussions was that held in Dublin in April, 1827, between Rev. Thomas Maguire and the Rev. Mr. Pope.

The Protestant archbishop of Tuam, Dr. Trench, and the archbishop of Dublin warmly seconded the proselytising campaign. Dr. Magee was especially bitter in his references to the Catholic Church, but he found a worthy opponent in the person of Dr. Doyle, Bishop of Kildare. In the hope of winning over the Catholics all sections of the Protestant party, the members of the Established Church, the Presbyterians and the Methodists displayed unwonted activity. No doctrine or practice of the Catholic Church was too sacred to escape denunciation. At the societies reports were read of numerous conversions. In Tuam, in Limerick, in Cavan where Lord Farnham was particularly active, large numbers

* Killen, Vol. II., p. 418.

were said to have read their recantations, but even shrewd Protestant observers were inclined to suspect at the time that the supposed conversions were not genuine.*

As a result of this campaign the Catholic clergy were obliged to drop the reserve they had hitherto maintained, and to speak out publicly in defence of their religion. The older generation of bishops and priests had been trained on the Continent, and their attitude towards popular movements in Ireland was largely influenced by the training they had received in France, Italy, and Spain. The results of the penal laws and of their foreign education were noticeable in their abstention from all interference in the public life of the country. But a new generation of priests had arisen, and young, active, capable bishops were at hand to give them a lead. Dr. Doyle, of Kildare, and Dr. MacHale, of Killala, were at hand to do what men like Dr. Troy and Dr. Moylan could never have done. Dr. Doyle, who had been professor in Carlow, was appointed bishop of Kildare and Leighlin in 1819. From the very moment of his appointment he set himself to initiate a new era in the history of Catholic affairs in Ireland. Besides attending to the spiritual and material wants of his own diocese he took a leading part in all the public questions of the day, emancipation, education, tithes and poor-law relief; and the letters written by him over the well-known signature, J. K. L., contributed much to enlighten public opinion in regard to the Catholic religion. His evidence, too, before the Parliamentary Commission of 1825 was praised equally by friends and foes. A few months after the consecration of Dr. Doyle as bishop of Kildare, Dr. MacHale, then professor at Maynooth, began a remarkable series of public letters over the signature of *Hierophilos*. They attracted universal attention both in Ireland and England. They marked out their author as a man well fit to assist in guiding the destinies of the Church at that dangerous crisis, and a few years later (1825) Dr.

* Killen, Vol. II., p. 428.

MacHale was appointed coadjutor bishop of Killala. Under the leadership of men like Drs. Doyle and MacHale, and under the influence of home training, a new spirit animated the Irish clergy. They no longer feared to associate themselves with the popular movements, and they spoke out boldly in defence of their religion against the preachers of the "New Reformation."

With religious feeling running thus high, and with the Catholics elated by the great victory they had just won, it is not to be wondered at that their leaders did not cease to agitate for a removal of the grievances of which they still justly complained. The Catholics were, indeed, emancipated by law, but they were still obliged to pay tithes for the support of a minister of religion whose spiritual ministrations they refused to accept; they were bound, too, to contribute to the Church cess for the repairs of the Protestant churches, and for paying the expenses connected with the celebration of divine worship, such as the salaries of the clerk and the sexton, and the cost of the bread and wine for communion.* Over this fund the Catholics had no control. In many of the towns, instead of the tithes, a peculiar contribution was levied under the title of the "ministers' money." While finally, though the majority of the people were Catholic, the Protestant Church was recognised as the Established Church of Ireland. To it had been assigned all the ecclesiastical possessions of the Catholic Church, and the powers of the government were at the disposal of its ministers to enforce their legal rights, and to maintain their position of domination. Many of the clergymen were magistrates, and though not a few of them were exceedingly kind and impartial, others of them acted in such a way as to irritate the Catholic population.

In the service of the Established Church in Ireland there were 4 archbishops, 18 bishops, and about 2,000 clergymen, including rectors and assistants. The total

* For Tithes, see *Evidence and Report of the Select Committee on Tithes*, 1831-32. Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, 1831-38. O'Brien, *Fifty Years of Concessions*, Vol. I., 365-530. *Full and Authentic Report of Tithe Debate*, Dublin, 1833.

annual salary of the archbishops and bishops was £151,117, the highest income being that of the archbishop of Armagh, who received £17,669, and the lowest being that of the bishop of Clonfert and Kilmacduagh, whose income did not exceed £3,260. The total annual revenues of the clergy of the Established Church were variously estimated by Lord John Russell, Lord Althorp, O'Connell and others, but, according to the lowest estimate, they reached close on £800,000. According to the tables submitted to Parliament in 1832 and in 1835 there were some parishes in which the population was exclusively Catholic, and many others where the number of Protestants did not exceed 100, and yet the exclusively, or nearly exclusively, Catholic parishes were obliged to contribute to the support of the Protestant Church. Furthermore, according to the official returns of 1829, out of a total number of 1,293 beneficed clergymen only 823 were resident. The other 470 were absent either by exemptions, licence, or for some other cause unexplained.*

The Presbyterians, estimated in 1834 as about 600,000, were also obliged to pay tithes, but they received some assistance from the state. In order to overcome their resistance to the Union, a hope was held out to them that a new Presbyterian university should be founded at Armagh, and that the royal bounty paid for the support of their Church should be increased. The university scheme was dropped, but in 1803 the annual *Regium Donum* was raised to about £15,000. This sum was further augmented in 1809.†

The total population of Ireland as estimated by competent authorities was 7,784,934 in 1831, 7,943,940 in 1834, and 8,175,124 at the census of 1841. The Commissioners of Public Instruction estimated that out of the total population in 1834 the Catholics numbered 6,427,712, the Episcopalians 852,064, the Presbyterians 642,356, the remainder belonging to several smaller sects.

* *Report of Commissioners on Tithes*, 1832. Appendix N.
† Killen, Vol. II., pp. 380-1.

The Catholics, therefore, who formed the vast body of the nation, were obliged to support by tithes and church cess the clergy and religion of a small dominant minority. From the historical circumstances of Ireland it was to be expected that the Protestants constituted the wealthier portion of the community. The Catholics, outside the cities were, as a rule, small farmers or labourers. Out of their small means they contributed to the support of their own clergy and at this particular time an effort was being made to provide some species of churches in places where hitherto the Catholics had been accustomed to worship under the broad canopy of heaven. According to the returns prepared by order of Lord Castlereagh in 1801 there were 4 Catholic archbishops, 22 bishops, 1,026 parish priests, and about 800 curates. The average income of the bishops was £300, though in the diocese of Kilfenora and Kilmacduagh it fell so low as £100, of the parish priests £65, and of the curates £10, together with free board and lodging.*

The tithes had been a source of trouble in Ireland during the eighteenth century. In 1735, the Irish Parliament passed the Tithe Agistment Act, according to which pasture lands should be exempt from the ecclesiastical tax. This law tended to increase the number of acres under pasturage to the gradual extinction of agriculture. The Catholics held only small farms, and were devoted for the most part to agriculture, and hence the burthen of the tithes fell heavily upon them. The disturbances in the South of Ireland in 1785, and in other parts of the country at a later period, were caused largely by this imposition, the removal of which was also one of the objects of the United Irishmen.

The tax was levied most unfairly. The proctors and other officials employed by the parsons to collect their revenues acted in many cases most unjustly, allowing the better classes to pay far less than their proportion, and obliging the poorer farmers, who could not afford to bribe them with money or intoxicating drink, to contri-

* *Memoirs and Correspondence of Castlereagh*, Vol. IV., pp. 97-173.

bute far more than their due share.* Cases of non-payment were referred to the courts presided over by the parson or his friends, and, as a result, the Catholics had little hope of securing justice. In Ulster, the Presbyterians had been more successful in their resistance. Many of the articles, such as hay, flax, and potatoes, were free from tithes in most of the northern counties, and even in the case of wheat and oats, tithable in all three provinces, the tax in Ulster was far less than in any of the other provinces. Thus, while the tax upon an acre of wheat was 10s. in Leinster, 10s. 6d. in Munster, and 10s. in Connaught, it was only 8s. in Ulster, and while oats were taxed at the rate of 7s. 6d., 8s., and 6s. in Leinster, Munster and Connaught respectively, the tithe in Ulster was only 5s. 5d.

In place of the variable amounts, tithe compositions were made in many parishes after the passing of the Tithe Composition Act.† But here, too, the same inequality could be detected. While the average rate of tithe composition payable in Leinster per Irish acre was 1s. 7½d., it was only 1s. 3¾d. in Ulster. According to the reports of the Tithe Commission in 1832, 1,485 parishes out of a total of 2,412 had taken advantage of the Tithe Composition Act, and the total amount of tithes derived from these at the period was £421,257.‡

Though Dr. Doyle and O'Connell did not agree on all public questions, they were united in their opposition to tithes. The pastoral § issued by Dr. Doyle on the subject was as strong in some passages as the speeches of O'Connell. In the circumstances, where the grievances were so pressing, it was not difficult to induce the people to support their spiritual and political leaders. The first conflict took place in 1830 in the parish of Graigue-na-managh, where the horse of the parish priest was seized for non-payment of tithes. The people stood by their parish priest, and refused to pay the tax. The forces of

* *Report of Tithes Commission*, 1832, pp. 84-95.
† 4 *Geo. IV.*, c. 99.
‡ *Report*, p. 176.
§ *Idem.*, Appendix 49-54.

the Crown were placed at the disposal of the parson, but after 600 men had been employed for two months only one-third of the amount had been recovered, and the army was obliged to withdraw (May, 1831). In June, a desperate affray took place between the sheriff's party and the peasantry at Newtownbarry. Twelve of the peasants were shot down in the streets, and though an inquiry was held, none of the yeomanry were punished. During the same year serious conflicts occurred at Thurles, Castlepollard and other districts in the midland counties. At Knocktopher a strong body of police accompanied the process servers, but in passing through a defile known as Carrickshock, they were surrounded by hundreds of peasants, who demanded that the process-servers should be surrendered. The officer refused to do so, and ordered the police to fire, he himself setting the example by shooting the leader of the crowd. The people closed in and attacked the police with all kinds of weapons. Eleven of the force were killed and seventeen dangerously wounded (14th Dec., 1831).

A committee was immediately appointed to inquire into the recent disturbances, and to report on the best method of collecting tithes and of relieving the wants of the clergy. In June, 1832, a bill was passed, by which £60,000 was granted for the relief of the clergy, and the government was empowered to recoup itself by collecting the outstanding tithes. In August of the same year the Tithe Composition Act was amended, so as to make tithe composition obligatory and permanent.* During the year 1832 "the tithe war" was renewed. Great meetings were held throughout the country to agitate against the payment of tithes. The people refused to buy the cattle that were seized by the sheriffs, and in many cases great difficulty was found in disposing of such property. At Doon, at Wallstown, and at Rathkeeran the people resisted the police and soldiers, and at the two latter places several of the peasants were killed.

* 2 & 3 *Wm. IV.*, *c.* 119.

The Reform Bills of 1832 went a certain distance in making Parliament representative not of a class but of the nation. The Irish Reform Bill, however, was the most unsatisfactory of the three measures. It fixed the number of representatives from Ireland at 105. The qualifications for the county voters, £10 freehold and £10 or £20 leasehold according as the lease was of 60 years or 14 years, and for the borough voters, £10 freehold or occupying tenancy, were far too high for a country with such a population as Ireland; and, as a consequence, though the number of county voters in Ireland before the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders was about 200,000, it was only 30,000 after the passing of the Reform Bill. In the general election that followed, O'Connell stood for the abolition of the tithes and repeal of the Union. He succeeded in returning 45 repealers, who were also opposed to tithes, and, in addition, 37 others were returned pledged to vote against the tithes. Thus out of a total of 105, 82 were in favour of the abolition. In the new Parliament the Whigs had an immense majority, and Earl Grey became Prime Minister.*

The first measure proposed in 1833 was a Coercion Bill, which was carried in spite of the violent opposition of O'Connell and his supporters. Lord Althorp introduced into the House of Lords a bill providing for the abolition of the Church cess, the imposition of a tax on all benefices worth more than £200, the reduction of the Protestant archbishoprics in Ireland from four to two, and of the bishoprics from eighteen to twelve, and the appropriation of the revenues to secular purposes. During the discussions, however, the appropriation clause was abandoned, but the remainder of the government proposal received the royal assent in August, 1833. This satisfied no party in Ireland, and the war against tithes went on as before. Ugly conflicts took place between the people and the military at Kilmurry, Carrigtwohill, and Mullinahone, and the government was

* O'Brien, Vol. II., p. 412.

obliged to announce that the collection of the tithes of 1831 which it had undertaken should be suspended. A further loan of £1,000,000 was made to relieve the wants of the clergy, and the tithe arrears amounting then to about £1,200,000 were accepted as security.

In 1834, a Tithe Bill was introduced and passed through the House of Commons. By this measure it was arranged that the tithes should be commuted into a land tax payable by the landlords, but this proposal was rejected by a large majority in the House of Lords (Aug., 1834). The news of its rejection was received with great jubilation by the ascendency party in Ireland, but the dreadful affray at Rathcormac, in which twelve people were killed and several others wounded, was a sufficient indication that the resistance to tithes could not be so easily overcome. In 1835, the Tories proposed another Tithe Commutation Bill, but the Whig party insisted that the principle of appropriation should be recognised. Peel, finding himself in a minority, resigned, and the Whigs returned to power under the leadership of Lord Melbourne.

O'Connell entered into very friendly relations with the new government. While both O'Connell and the Whigs clung to their own particular views on the Union and Repeal, an informal understanding was arrived at on minor matters, and O'Connell issued the command that the agitation should cease until the new administration had an opportunity of developing their policy (5th April, 1835). In June a new Tithe Commutation bill was introduced. According to it tithes should be commuted into a rent-charge payable by the landlord, but it was arranged that the landlords should be obliged to pay only 68¼ per cent. of the existing tithe composition. In 157 parishes, according to Lord Morpeth, there were no Episcopalians, in 194 less than 10, in 198 less than 20, in 133 less than 30, in 107 less than 40, and in 77 less than 50.* Those benefices, which contained less than 50 members of the Established Church, were to be sup-

* *Hansard*, 3rd Series, XXVIII., 1319-44.

pressed, and the revenues, after making some provision for the religious wants of the Episcopalians in such parishes, were to be devoted to the promotion of education in Ireland. The measure passed through the House of Commons, but the appropriation clause was rejected by the Lords (24th Aug., 1835), and the government decided to abandon the bill.

The disturbances broke out anew in Ireland. An association of Protestant laymen had been formed to assist the clergy in protecting their rights; and as the Under-Secretary, Thomas Drummond,* was unwilling to allow the police and soldiers to act as tithe-collectors, recourse was had to the Court of Exchequer to compel the executive authorities to lend military assistance, but Drummond was firm in the position he had taken up, and the new Exchequer writs were as useless as the measures that had been adopted previously. Another Tithes bill was introduced in 1836 (April), but as the Lords again rejected the appropriation clauses the bill was abandoned. Finally, in August, 1838, a Tithe Commutation bill was carried through both Houses of Parliament. It provided that the tithes reduced by 25 per cent. should be converted into a rent-charge payable by the landlord, and the arrears of tithes were to be wiped out. The result could not be considered a victory for O'Connell's alliance with the Whigs. The act was severely criticised by Sharman-Crawford, who pointed out that it made the position of the clergy more secure by guaranteeing them their tithes, and that the tenants were not likely to receive any relief, because the landlords would proceed to raise the rents, and the tenants should be obliged to pay in shape of increased rent what they had been obliged to pay as tithes. In opposition to O'Connell, Crawford insisted that the Whigs should have abolished the tithes completely, but O'Connell was able to satisfy the people, and the agitation was dropped.

According to all authorities the existence of the greatest distress among the peasantry of Ireland, especially during the last quarter of the eighteenth century and

* O'Brien, *Life and Letters of Thomas Drummond*, London, 1889.

the first half of the last century, cannot be denied. The reasons for such a state of affairs are easily understood. The old ecclesiastical lands, upon the owners of which the care of the poor devolved, were seized and handed over to spiritual and lay owners, who were almost equally regardless of the wants of the Catholic natives; the great body of the people were driven to the mountains and bogs, where it was nearly impossible for them to eke out an existence; the industries were in great measure suppressed by law; and agriculture was discouraged by tithes and other imposts. With the increase of the population there was a corresponding increase in the number of small uneconomic holdings, and as the prices of produce suddenly fell after the conclusion of the Napoleonic wars, the mass of the people were reduced to a starving condition. The landlords, unable to secure the rents from the small holders, and anxious to rid themselves of a class who, having lost their franchise, were no longer of political value, evicted whole districts in order to "consolidate" their property. These people were scattered through the towns and villages, and dependent for the most part on the charity of those who were themselves almost equally poor. At a time when the population of Ireland was less than 8,000,000, fully 2,385,000 were in a state of intermittent starvation.*

Something, indeed, had been done by the public authorities to relieve the wretchedness of the sick and infirm poor. In 1765, an Act was passed for the establishment of county infirmaries to be supported out of the local funds, and in 1781 the fever hospitals were established and maintained from the same source. Dispensaries were established in connection with the county infirmaries in 1805, lunatic asylums were undertaken in 1817, and sanitary officers appointed in 1819.† A number of institutions for children were maintained, but they were, as a rule, entirely Protestant in their character and management.

* *Report of Poor Law Commission*, 1906, Vol. I., p. 2.
† O'Brien, *Fifty Years of Concessions*, Vol. I., pp. 548-9.

Various remedies were proposed to relieve the chronic distress in Ireland. Some advocated wholesale emigration, some advocated a scheme of remunerative public works, some an amendment of the land laws, and others, like O'Connell, repeal of the Union. Dr. Doyle, of Kildare, was particularly active in his advocacy of the claims of the poor. He appeared before the select committee appointed to deal with the question in 1830, and his evidence revealed a terrible tale of misery and of heartlessness on the part of the landowners. Dr. Doyle wanted some measures of poor law relief, as did also Smith O'Brien,* while O'Connell at one stage advocated repeal as the first and best measure for the relief of the distress.† It would appear as if Dr. MacHale agreed with O'Connell in tracing the source of the distress to the fact that the laws were made and administered by men who had no knowledge of, or sympathy with, the wants of the country.

In 1833, Lord Grey appointed a commission to inquire into the state of the poor, and to report on the best means of relieving their wants. The members of this commission were Dr. Murray, the archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Whately, Rev. James Carlisle, Lord Killeen, Messrs. Hort, Corrie, Naper, Wrightson, Blake and Bicheno. The commissioners made an honest effort to carry out their instructions. They examined witnesses representative of all classes and interests, and early in 1836 they presented their report. They were strongly opposed to the introduction of the English workhouse system into Ireland. That system had been devised to make the lazy and idle seek work in a country where work could be got, but in Ireland men were willing and anxious to labour even for twopence a day, and could find no employment. The commissioners, too, were opposed to emigration as a permanent remedy, and regarded it only as a temporary expedient which might be resorted to as auxiliary to a plan of amelioration.

1833

* *Plan for the Relief of the Poor*, 1831.
† Fitzpatrick, *Life of Dr. Doyle*, Vol. II., pp. 368 *sqq.*

They recommended that public works should be undertaken so as to afford employment to those able and willing to work. The recommendations made by them included reclamation of waste land, the drainage and fencing of land, increasing the funds of the Board of Works, building of healthy houses, agricultural instruction, enlargement of leasing powers, transfer of fiscal power from the grand juries to local boards, direct labour, and permission for the Board of Works to undertake schemes of improvement subject to the approval of the county boards. Furthermore, they recommended that legal provision should be made for the relief and support of the curable lunatics, idiots, epileptics, cripples, deaf and dumb and blind. For these classes, as well as for the sick poor, institutions should be established and maintained out of the rates, medical attendance should be supplied to the poor in their own houses, and provision should be made for relief of aged sick, the orphans and the families of sick persons. For the vagrants who were unwilling to work they recommended the establishment of penitentiaries.*

These recommendations are now recognised by all parties to have been excellent for a country situated as Ireland then was, but Lord John Russell was determined to introduce the English workhouse system, and, instead of adopting the recommendations of the commissioners, he despatched a young Scotchman to Ireland, who reported in a few weeks according to the instructions he had received, and in February, 1837, the Poor Law Relief Bill was introduced. The death of William IV. stopped the progress of the measure, but it was re-introduced in December, and received the royal assent in July, 1838. According to the Act 100 workhouses were to be established for the relief of the poor; the country was to be divided into unions, in each of which a board, two-thirds of which consisted of elected members and one-third of *ex-officio* guardians, was to administer relief; these local boards were to be controlled by a central board

* *Report of Vice-Regal Commission*, 1906, Vol. I., pp. 3-5.

in Dublin, consisting of commissioners chosen by the Poor Law Commissioners of England; and the landlords and tenants of each union were to contribute equally to the support of the poor within the union, or rather within their electoral division of the union.

From the beginning the workhouses were unpopular in Ireland, and no attempt was made to remove the natural prejudices of the people against them. The whole system was managed by English Protestant officials imported by Mr. Nicholls, to whom the organisation of the workhouses was virtually committed.* The elected boards might have done something to make the institutions less unpopular, but the boards were restricted by the central department, and, besides, the elected guardians were almost helpless in presence of the *ex-officio* members, whose numbers were increased in 1847 from one-third to one-half of the whole body of guardians of each union. These *ex-officio* members were, as a rule, landlords and Protestants, the clergy who were most in touch with the poor being carefully excluded by law. Though the vast body of the paupers were Catholics, the whole system was controlled by Protestants, by a central board for over twenty years exclusively Protestant, and by the local *ex-officio* guardians.

In 1861, out of every 100 paupers, 87 were Catholics, and yet the officials, especially in Ulster, were largely Protestant. There were then 163 clerks, 87 of whom were Protestants, and of the 45 employed in Ulster only 5 were Catholics. Of 156 masters, only 85 were Catholics, 3 of whom only were in Ulster; of 163 matrons, 88 were Catholics; of 61 school teachers in Ulster, only 6 were Catholics. In the medical appointments the proportion of Catholics was far lower. In several of the workhouses, especially in Ulster, where the majority of the inmates were Catholic, not a single Catholic official was employed.† Hence, it is easy to understand how the Catholic bishops felt obliged to issue a strong con-

* O'Brien, Vol. II., p. 567.

† Perraud, Vol. II., pp. 195-99. Cullen, Vol. II., pp. 1-75.

demnation of the working of the system in a joint pastoral letter published in 1859.

There was reason, too, to complain of the cost of administration of the establishments, of the treatment meted out to the inmates, of the provisions made for religious worship, and of the rule by which all children brought to the workhouse, whose parents were unknown, should be registered as belonging to the Protestant religion.* A commission was appointed to examine into the working of the poorhouses in 1861, and a petition was presented from the Catholics of Ireland in 1862, praying that certain changes might be introduced. Notwithstanding the slight improvements introduced, the institutions did not become more popular with those who really needed relief.

In 1860, the guardians of Limerick Union were determined to introduce the Sisters of Mercy into the workhouse, but the Local Government Board offered every opposition. The guardians, however, clung to their resolution, and the Sisters were duly installed (1861). Other unions followed the example of Limerick, and since the Local Government Act placed the workhouses under more popular control, members of the female religious congregations have been placed in charge of many workhouses in the Catholic districts. In this way something was done to make these institutions more acceptable to the sick and infirm who required assistance, but it is admitted on all sides that a radical change in the system is required, and that it is necessary to return to most of the recommendations made by the commissioners in 1836.†

Although the law of 1793 permitted Catholics to become members of corporations, and the law of 1829 allowed them to sit, act and vote in the House of Commons and the House of Lords, they were still jealously excluded from the municipal corporations of Ireland. In the 168 enfranchised boroughs existing in Ireland in

* Letter to Guardians of Galway Union, 16th Dec., 1858.
† *Report of Vice-Regal Commission*, Vol. I., 1906.

1835 the power was in the hands of bigoted corporations, which in many cases mismanaged the administration and refused to concede to the Catholic majority the slightest voice in the expenditure of taxes levied for the most part from Catholics. In Tuam alone had the Catholics succeeded in wresting a fair share of the power from the ascendency class, but the corporations of Dublin, Cork, Limerick, Galway, Kilkenny, Drogheda, Waterford, &c., were still practically closed against Catholics. All the privileges and patronage were reserved for Protestants. The report of the Parliamentary Commission appointed to examine into the affairs of these corporations revealed a shocking tale of intolerance and corruption.*

In 1835, a Municipal Reform Bill for England was passed by the Whigs, and an attempt was made to enact some similar measure for Ireland. Nobody in the House of Commons attempted to defend the existing system, but it was urged that such a reform as was proposed by the bill introduced in 1835 would place the whole power in the hands of the Catholics. Sir Robert Peel urged that the corporations should be abolished, but that instead of establishing elective bodies to take their place, the government should appoint commissioners to administer municipal affairs. The bill introduced in 1835 was passed through the House of Commons, but was allowed to drop. The House of Lords succeeded in preventing any legislation on this question in 1836, 1837, 1838 and 1839. In 1840, a measure was passed by which ten of the largest towns, Dublin, Belfast, Cork, Limerick, Kilkenny, Waterford, Drogheda, Derry, Clonmel and Sligo, were vested with corporate rights, and in these the elective franchise was fixed at £10 rating. In the other 58 corporate towns the corporations were abolished, but wherever the corporate property was valued at £100 or over they might apply to the Lord Lieutenant for a charter. In the other towns the affairs were to be managed by the poor law guardians. In this

* *Parliamentary Papers*, 1835, Vol. XXVII.

way the power of the ascendency class was broken in the larger cities, and the Catholics got a voice in the control of municipal affairs proportionate to their numbers and wealth. As soon as the measure came into operation in Ireland O'Connell was elected Lord Mayor of Dublin (1841) by the reformed corporation.

The agitation that had been begun by O'Connell for Repeal was allowed to die out to a great extent during the years of the Whig alliance, but in 1840 O'Connell had begun to realise that the Whigs were as hostile to Ireland as the Tories, and that in a repeal of the Union lay the only hope of redress. The new agitation was publicly supported by the clergy and by a large body of the bishops, notably by Dr. MacHale of Tuam, Dr. Cantwell of Meath, and Dr. O'Higgins of Ardagh. Dr. Doyle, the bishop of Kildare, who had done so much to put a new life into the Catholic body in Ireland, and to reform the abuses which had crept into the Church during the penal days, died in 1834 at the comparatively youthful age of 48. His zeal and restless activity, his learning, his literary power, and the manly, independent tone he adopted towards his adversaries and the adversaries of Ireland gave him a place in the popular estimation hardly second to that of O'Connell himself. Though he did not always agree with the aims or the methods of O'Connell, yet the very example which he set prepared the way for the great political agitation which O'Connell was about to inaugurate in real earnest. In the same year in which the great bishop of Kildare passed away the see of Tuam became vacant, and the name of Dr. MacHale, the bishop of Killala, was placed second on the list by the clergy of Tuam. The bishops of the province of Tuam unanimously recommended the appointment of Dr. MacHale.

By the letters of *Hierophilos,* written while still a professor of Maynooth, and by the courageous stand in defence of the poor which he had taken as bishop of Killala, he had earned the love and admiration of the Irish Catholics and the deep distrust of the English and

landlord party in Ireland. Hence, they left no stone unturned to prevent his appointment to the archiepiscopal see of Tuam. Lord Melboure employed an agent to represent to the authorities in Rome that Dr. MacHale was a man "fond of political agitation, and of supporting schemes which tended to imperil the civil power," that his letters and speeches were of a seditious character, and that he was not a fit person to guide the destinies of an Irish archbishopric. Gregory XVI., however, refused to yield to such objections. He had copies of the incriminated speeches read to him, and satisfied himself that they contained nothing reprehensible; and in August, 1834, he put an end to the intrigue by appointing Dr. MacHale to Tuam.* The subsequent action of the new archbishop showed that the English Prime Minister had good reason to fear this appointment to Tuam. Dr. MacHale was ably supported by Dr. O'Higgins appointed bishop of Ardagh in 1829, and by Dr. Cantwell, who was appointed to Meath in 1830. During these years the Irish bishops were sharply divided in regard to the National schools. Dr. Murray of Dublin (1823-1852) and Dr. Crolly of Armagh (1835-1849) rather favoured the system, while Dr. MacHale and his friends carried on a strong agitation against them. On the question of the Queen's Colleges the same disagreement of opinion made itself felt until the decision of the Propaganda put an end to the controversy.

The introduction of the Charitable Bequests Bill by Sir Robert Peel in 1844 created a new subject for dissension. At an earlier period Catholic institutions, especially Catholic educational institutions, were regarded as illegal, and, consequently, bequests made to them were void in law. The Emancipation Act in 1829 rendered some change necessary, and in 1832 a measure was passed extending to Catholics the same legal protection in this regard as had been granted to the Dissenters by

* *Cf. Greville's Memoirs*, 1903, Vol. V., pp. 221-2. Letters of Wiseman, Murray, O'Connor, *apud* Reilly, *Life of John MacHale*, Vol. I., pp. 243-50.

the Toleration Acts of 1689 and 1719. This law of 1832 was passed only for England, but it was apparently accepted as a guide by the Irish judges in their decisions. The position of Catholic charitable institutions was still, however, very insecure. The bequests to bishops or priests for charitable or educational institutions were regarded by the law as personal gifts, and as such should go to their legal heirs and not to their successors in the same office. To remedy such a state of affairs O'Connell wished that each bishop and parish priest should be recognised as a legal corporation, that the names of such persons should be duly registered, and that the production of this register should be received by the Court of Chancery as conclusive evidence of their title.

Such a scheme did not satisfy Sir Robert Peel. According to the new measure as passed in 1844 a body, consisting of three of the Irish judges and ten commissioners, should be appointed as "Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests, Ireland." To this body should be committed the entire control of charitable bequests in Ireland. The commissioners were to be appointed and dismissed by the Crown. Furthermore, it was provided that five of the commissioners should be Catholics, and that in regard to Catholic charities all questions relating to the usage or discipline of the Catholic Church should be referred to a committtee of the Catholic commissioners.* Such a proposal was regarded with great disfavour by a large section of the Irish clergy and people. They objected to the measure on the grounds that it forbade under pain of nullity all grants or bequests to monastic orders, that it made it necessary for the validity of bequests of real estate that they should have been executed three calendar months before the death of the testator, that it limited the rights of the bishop in his control and administration of ecclesiastical property, and that, finally, the government, by appointing disloyal Catholics, might convert the whole charities of the Catholic Church to purposes very different from

* Statutes, 1844, 7 & 8 Vict., c. 97, pp. 777-81.

those intended by the testators.* These were undoubtedly weighty objections, which the amendments introduced by the government during the passage of the bill did not tend to remove. On the other hand, the measure conferred immense advantages by removing the legal insecurity which surrounded Catholic donations.

Feeling in Ireland and England was divided in regard to the measure. A large body of the bishops, clergy, and people protested against it, and their protests were ably supported by Frederick Lucas in the columns of the *Tablet*. When the measure was passed a meeting of the bishops was called to discuss the question of accepting the seats offered to them on the Board. The vast majority supported Dr. MacHale in his opposition to such a step, but in the end the meeting separated without coming to a definite decision. Each individual was allowed to act as he pleased. Dr. MacHale appealed to the Propaganda to interfere, but though the opinion in Rome was not favourable to the measure, no formal prohibition was issued, and Drs. Crolly and Murray accepted the appointments offered to them. The laws affecting the functions of the Charitable Bequests Board were modified in 1867 and in 1871.†

The agitation for repeal which was resumed by O'Connell in 1840 was conducted on vigorous lines. The people rallied around him as they did in the days of emancipation; immense meetings were organised in different portions of the country, and for a time it seemed as if the government should be obliged to capitulate. But the English ministers realised the weakness of the position of the Irish leader, that his followers were not prepared for armed resistance, and that by throwing down the gauntlet they could force him to retreat from the position he had assumed, and by his retreat, they might hope to break the spirit and resolution of his followers. Hence, in 1843, the Clontarf meeting was proclaimed, and O'Connell and the other prominent leaders, lay and clerical, were arrested, put upon their

* *Life of Frederick Lucas*, Vol. I., pp. 167 *sqq.*

† 30 & 31 Vict., c. 54; 34 & 35 Vict., c. 102.

trial, and condemned to imprisonment or heavy fines (30th May, 1844). The verdict was set aside on appeal, and the prisoners were released, but the mischief was already done; the resolution and the hopes of the people were crushed, and the agitation lost all its force. O'Connell himself seems never to have rallied after this defeat. The conduct of affairs gradually passed into the hands of his worthless son; the divisions between the O'Connell section and the Young Ireland party were increased; and while the country was face to face with a terrible famine, the political leaders were wasting their time in senseless disputes. One section thought that the only hope for Ireland lay in an alliance with an English party, another, that the time for constitutional agitation had passed. In the midst of the ruin and havoc wrought by misgovernment, famine and dissension, O'Connell's health began to fail. He left Ireland in 1847 on a journey to Rome, but on his way he died at Genoa 15th May, 1847. His heart, which he had bequeathed to Rome, was conveyed there, and enshrined in the Church of St. Agatha. Great funeral celebrations were held in Rome by order of Pius IX., and at one of these, in the Church of Sant' Andrea Della Valle, Padre Ventura preached a remarkable oration, which, on account of its boldness and independence, alarmed the Austrian government for the safety of its Italian possessions. The remains of O'Connell were transferred to Dublin, and laid to rest amidst scenes of national mourning in the cemetery at Glasnevin.

During the long struggle for Catholic Emancipation and for the abolition of the tithes the Catholic bishops and clergy had shaken off the reserve imposed by foreign training and by years of persecution, and had taken a conspicuous part in the struggle. On the sufferings of the poor, the wholesale evictions carried on after 1829, and the necessity for repeal of the Union, they continued the same forward policy, and the support of such bishops as Drs. MacHale, Cantwell and O'Higgins was of immense assistance to O'Connell in rallying the

people under his banner. The authorities in England were alarmed by the appearance of this new force in Irish politics. So long as the peasantry were content to be driven in crowds like dumb beasts to the hustings nobody complained, but once the clergy began to advise the people to use their votes in order to redress their religious, social, and national grievances the cry of the state in danger was immediately raised. To remedy the evil, Wellington and Peel were anxious to introduce the old question of the veto in the Emancipation Act, but as that was impossible, they disfranchised the forty-shilling freeholders.

Soon, however, it was found that a nation when fully aroused is dangerous, even though disfranchised. Hence, during the period of the tithe agitation various schemes were put forward for silencing the clergy by inaugurating a system of state payment. O'Connell suggested that instead of an annual grant which was certain to sap the independence of the clergy, the goods of the Established Church should be sold and the proceeds divided proportionately between the members of the three principal religious bodies in Ireland. In this way, he thought, the Catholic religion might be endowed, the poor relieved from the necessity of supporting the clergy, and the independence of the ecclesiastical body guaranteed. Such a scheme was impracticable in the circumstances, and did not suit the Whig ministers. In 1837, the rumour of state payment was so persistent that the Irish bishops felt it necessary to declare their strongest detestation of such a project, and their determination "to resist by every means in their power a measure so fraught with mischief to the independence and purity of the Catholic religion in Ireland." At their annual meeting in 1841 they requested Dr. Murray to summon a general meeting of their body in case he should discover "that the odious and alarming scheme of a state provision for the clergy was contemplated by the government, and in 1843 they determined to publish these resolutions in order that all parties

might know the attitude of the bishops on such an important question.*

When this scheme for muzzling the Irish clergy failed owing to the strong opposition of the bishops it was determined to have recourse to Rome. In order to facilitate negotiations with the Pope an Act was passed in 1844 (August) entitled "An Act to repeal certain penal enactments made against her Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects." By this measure most of the old penal enactments were expressly repealed and removed from the statute book.† While the way was thus being smoothed in official circles for opening up diplomatic relations with Rome, steps of another kind were being taken to convince the Roman authorities that something must be done to restrain the political activity of the Irish clergy. Famine and eviction so maddened the people that many outrages were committed in different parts of the country. These were duly magnified and carefully reported at Rome. The clergy were charged with being accessories to the crimes by using their churches for the purpose of harangues against landlordism and misgovernment. Lord Shrewsbury, a leading English Catholic peer, openly charged Dr. MacHale and the clergy with having encouraged murder and disorder, but he received such a castigation from the archbishop of Tuam that he must have regretted his interference in Irish political affairs.‡ The rejection, too, of the Queen's Colleges by the great body of the Irish bishops increased the anxiety of the English ministers to secure the presence of a nuncio in London, and of an English ambassador at Rome. Many of the English noblemen warmly seconded such a project, and even Dr. Wiseman thought that the English government should send an agent to impress its views on Cardinal Fransoni and Padre Ventura, who were the special advisers of the Pope in Irish affairs.§

* *Dublin Review*, Vol. XVI., p. 186.
† Statutes, 7 & 8 Vict., c. 102.
‡ Reilly, *Life of MacHale*, Vol. II., pp. 73-115.
§ *The Greville Memoirs*, Vol. VI., pp. 111-12.

The young Pope, Pius IX., who was at that time the ardent friend of political reform, was in no mood to yield to the wishes of the English government, and Padre Ventura missed no opportunity of showing his sympathy with the Irish demands. The English agent, Lord Minto, was instructed to go to Rome nominally on business in connection with the *Sonderbund*, but in reality to help on the scheme of opening up diplomatic relations between Rome and England (1847). Fortunately, Ireland had a most competent representative in Rome at this period, Dr. Cullen, the rector of the Irish College. He watched every movement of the English party at Rome, and was untiring in his efforts to checkmate them. Dr. Slattery, the archbishop of Cashel, who was consulted by Cardinal Fransoni on the conduct of the clergy, sent back a very strong and spirited reply in which he traced the disorders in Ireland to their true source.*

Towards the end of 1847 (December), it was publicly announced by Lord Landsdowne in the House of Lords that a bill was about being introduced to establish diplomatic relations with Rome. Frederick Lucas, the staunch friend of Ireland at this period, opened a campaign against such a measure in the columns of the *Tablet*, and he was warmly supported by the English Catholic Association of St. Thomas of Canterbury. These men had a keener appreciation of the designs of the government than others of their countrymen, and in a great meeting held in London (March, 1848) they voiced the opposition of the great body of English Catholics to such a measure.† The bill was, however, introduced in the House of Lords in 1848, and having passed through the different stages received the royal assent in August.‡ But the refusal, according to the terms of an amendment which had been introduced during the discussion of the bill, to accept an ecclesiastic

* For this correspondence, *cf. Reilly's Life of MacHale*, Vol. II., pp. 109-22

† *Life of Frederick Lucas*, Vol. I., pp. 287-307.

‡ *Hansard*, Vol. CLXVII., p. 768.

as Papal ambassador, the strong representation made at Rome by Dr. MacHale and Dr. Higgins, who had gone out as the representatives of twenty-three bishops against the Queen's Colleges, the thorough sympathy of England with the revolutionary party in Rome, and the temporary overthrow of the Papal government, put an end to the scheme. Since the days of the veto never had the Catholic religion in Ireland been in such danger as at that particular period.

When this scheme proved abortive and when the attempted rebellion was suppressed; a new plan for pacifying Ireland was proposed by Charles Buller. He suggested "strong government, abolition of jury unanimity in criminal cases," emigration to the Cape of Good Hope, the constitution of a labour board, and the payment of the Catholic clergy £350,000 annually out of a fund to be raised in Ireland.* The scheme was favourably received by the Cabinet, and Mr. Redington was deputed to sound the Irish bishops. He had an interview with Dr. Murray, and was obliged to report to his employers that it would be useless to attempt such a measure,† and the state payment fell through once more.

While Ireland was face to face with famine the political leaders were in open conflict; the fever for dissension seemed to have infected every important section in the country; and while O'Connell and the Young Ireland party were disputing about abstract principles of morality nothing was done to meet the impending calamity. From the establishment of the *Nation* in 1842, many of O'Connell's supporters distrusted the leaders of the new movement. The young men wanted a more independent policy. They distrusted the Whigs and every alliance with political parties in England. They quarrelled with O'Connell on the Queen's Colleges, they resented the attitude of his son, John O'Connell, and finally, on the question of the legality of using other weapons except moral persuasion in the

* *Greville's Memoirs*, Vol. VI., p. 227.
† *Idem.*, p. 243.

achievement of liberty they retired from the Repeal Association. At that period they were as unready for physical force as was O'Connell himself, and soon they themselves were split up into two sections, one led by Mitchell, who insisted upon immediate rebellion, though no preparations had been made, another which wished for delay. A conflict was prematurely forced by the government, the attempted rising was suppressed, and most of the leaders arrested and transported.

While Old Ireland and Young Ireland were engaged in a life and death struggle for supremacy the country was decimated by famine.* The wholesale evictions carried out by the landlords during the previous twenty years, the grouping of the people on small uneconomic farms, the want of industries, and the total dependence of a large percentage of the population on the potato crop, could not fail to lead to some national catastrophe. The attention of the government had been repeatedly directed to the danger of the situation, but no steps were taken to remedy it. Workhouses were, indeed, established to demoralise the people, but when the stress of famine came, the unions in many places became bankrupt, and the workhouse system was powerless to afford relief. While thousands were dying with hunger and fever the government looked on calmly, and when at last some measures of relief were taken, they were utterly inadequate, unproductive of any permanent good to the country, and carried out with the maximum of expense, and the minimum of consolation or advantage to the sufferers. Between the years 1846 and 1851, it is calculated that 729,092 of the people died of want, and 1,240,737 emigrants left the Irish shores to seek a new home. Of these emigrants about 17 per cent. perished from fevers on the emigrant ships or after their arrival in Canada or the United States. Thus, in five years, Ireland lost nearly 2,000,000 by death or emigration; and, what was worst of all, the example of the

* O'Rourke, *History of the Great Irish Famine*, 3 ed., Dublin, 1902. *Report of the Census Commissioners*, 1851. Trevelyan, *The Irish Crisis* (Ed. Rev.), 1848.

emigrants in these years proved only too catching, and the problem of the surplus population was solved in a way most pleasing to Ireland's enemies, and most disastrous for the nation itself.

While the country was prostrate after the famine Dr. Crolly died at Drogheda (1849).* Various names were mentioned in connection with the vacant see, but in the end Dr. Cullen, rector of the Irish College in Rome, was appointed. He had already done good work as rector by opposing all the intrigues of the English agents in Rome, and by loyally supporting the policy of the majority of the bishops in regard to the Board of Charitable Bequests and the Queen's Colleges. During the revolution in Rome in 1848 he succeeded in saving the property of the Propaganda from the revolutionaries, and Pius IX. was, therefore, not unwilling to mark his appreciation of his merits and service by yielding to the requests of Dr. MacHale and Dr. Slattery of Cashel, when they petitioned for the appointment of Dr. Cullen to Armagh.† He was appointed in December, 1849, and consecrated in February in the Church of St. Agatha, the Church of the Irish College in Rome.

The Irish bishops had already decided to hold a national synod for the settlement of the difficulties that had arisen previously regarding the national schools and the Queen's Colleges, and for putting an end to many abuses and irregularities which had crept in by reintroducing the normal canonical discipline and regulations of the Church. Dr. Cullen, as primate, was appointed Apostolic delegate for the national synod which was convoked to meet at Thurles in 1850. Dr. Cullen was ably supported in the work of preparation for the synod by Dr. MacHale, and both prelates were unanimous in their attitude of opposition to the Queen's Colleges.‡ At the close of the synod a pastoral letter was issued by the bishops, in which they announced the condemnation of the Queen's Colleges, and their deter-

* Crolly, *Life of Dr. Crolly*, Dublin, 1851.
† *Life of MacHale*, Vol. II., pp. 214-25.
‡ *Decreta Synodi Plenariae apud Thurles habitae*, Dublin, 1851.

mination to found a Catholic University. They were unsparing, too, in their denunciations of the treatment meted out to the unfortunate Irish tenants by the owners of the soil.

Nor was it strange that the bishops felt it their duty to call attention to the position of the Irish tenants at this period. The condition of the country was sad in the extreme. O'Connell was dead, and the remnants of the party he had created were struggling to secure places from the Whigs. The Young Irelanders, with the exception of Duffy, had been transported or had fled. Frederick Lucas, the editor of the *Tablet,* who had worked so indefatigably on behalf of the Irish Catholics, resolved to transfer the *Tablet* from London to Dublin (1850). A few priests in Kilkenny established local societies for the protection of the tenants in the district, and the success of their efforts led to the national conference held in Dublin in 1850. It was attended by representatives of the Catholics and Presbyterians, and the Tenants' League was formed to demand fair rents and fixity of tenure. Duffy, Lucas and Dr. MacKnight were the prominent leaders in the new movement. It was determined to create an independent Parliamentary party, and in order to rally the country to this programme a series of meetings was undertaken in different parts of the country.

While the Tenants' League was completing the work of organisation the Catholic hierarchy was re-established in England, and Lord John Russell, the Prime Minister, wrote his famous Durham letter. A wild anti-Catholic agitation was begun in England, and threats were held out that at the opening of Parliament the penal code would be put in force once more. Such a movement in England was dangerous for the new alliance between the Catholics and a certain portion of the Northern Presbyterians. Religious feeling in the country naturally ran high, but it was thought that the crisis might pass over without Catholic interests in Ireland being seriously involved.

But when Parliament met Lord John Russell, in his speech on the introduction of the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, directed nearly all his attacks against the Irish Catholics. He denounced the conduct of Dr. Cullen and of the other bishops in daring to hold an important synod without previous negotiations with the government, and especially in daring to condemn the Queen's Colleges, and the treatment meted out to the tenants by the Irish landowners. To put an end to such aggression he proposed to make it penal for any bishop to assume as the title of his bishopric the name of any city, town, place, or territory in the United Kingdom, that if any bishop did so he was liable to a heavy fine, all deeds and documents signed by him should be illegal and void, all bequests for the maintenance of the bishopric should be void, and all charitable donations devised on trust to a bishop by the title of his see should pass to the Crown, and should be disposed of at the queen's pleasure. Such a measure, if passed in this form, would undoubtedly have had serious consequences for Ireland, especially in regard to charitable bequests, and was one, therefore, which called for serious resistance. From February till August the discussion went on in the House of Commons and the House of Lords. During the progress of the bill it was considerably modified, and before it received the royal assent (August, 1851), the storm of bigotry having spent itself, the new penal enactment was suddenly dropped. In 1871 it was repealed.

During the discussions on the measure indignation meetings were held in Ireland, and an active opposition was carried on in Parliament by Keogh, Sadleir, and their friends, all of whom were at this period the trusted friends of Sharman-Crawford, the great Irish land reformer. When the bill was passed a Catholic Defence Association was organised to resist aggression (August, 1851), and amongst the principal men in this association were the members who had conducted the Parliamentary campaign against the bill during the previous

session. Dr. Cullen of Armagh, Dr. MacHale of Tuam, and Frederick Lucas were united in their support of the new association, while, on the other hand, Duffy and his friends, anxious to secure the co-operation of the Northern Presbyterians, did not conceal their opposition to the Defence Association. Duffy's articles at the period were calculated to give offence in many quarters, and to confirm the suspicions that had been already circulated in Ireland by one section that he was the ally of a revolutionary socialistic party, and by the supporters of Mitchell that he was in the pay of the British government. Thus, from the beginning, there was a division between the Catholic Defence Association and the section of the Tenants' League which supported Duffy and the *Nation*. This was very unfortunate, especially as the League could boast of a very limited membership, and as it had already alienated many of its supporters by banning the question of repeal in order not to alienate the Presbyterian party. The strength of the League can be judged by the fact that although the first conference had pledged itself to raise £10,000 to defray expenses, yet, when the election of 1852 was upon them it was found that Leinster had contributed only £810, Ulster £132, Munster £130, and Connaught nothing.*

In the elections of 1852 candidates were run by the Defence Association and by the Tenants' League. Duffy and Lucas were returned, the former for New Ross, the latter for Meath. In the North of Ireland, for which the League was willing to make such sacrifices, not a single thoroughgoing Tenants' League candidate was returned. Sharman-Crawford was defeated. After the elections a conference was held in Dublin, attended by about forty Irish members. William Keogh and Sadlier were active at the meeting, and a resolution was passed that the Irish members returned on Tenant-right principles should hold themselves independent of, and in opposition to, all parties who would not pledge themselves to a measure embodying the prin-

* Duffy, *League of the North and South*, p. 181.

ciples of Sharman-Crawford's Land Bill.* No men of the party were louder in their declarations of unflinching opposition than Keogh, Sadleir, and their associates. In Parliament the government of Lord Derby was overthrown in December, 1852, and a coalition ministry was formed, with Lord Aberdeen as Prime Minister, and Lord John Russell as Secretary of State. The Peelites secured a large share of office in the Cabinet, and the liberal attitude which this section had adopted on the Ecclesiastical Titles bill gave them some claim to the friendly consideration of the Irish party.† But friendly consideration was one thing, the acceptance of office under such a government another. To the astonishment of most people, when the names of the new officials were announced it was found that William Keogh was Solicitor-General for Ireland, and John Sadleir a Lord of the Treasury. A conference of the Tenants' League was called in Dublin to consider the new situation. It was soon found that Dr. MacKnight and most of the Presbyterians refused to condemn the men who had taken office, and the very existence of the League was threatened. The conference, however, condemned them by a large majority, as did also the Catholic Defence Association the following day (Jan., 1853). Dr. MacHale addressed a letter (15th Jan., 1853) to George Henry Moore, one of the ablest of the independent party, in which he expressed his views on the pledge-breakers and pledge-breaking in no uncertain manner.

Unfortunately, however, there were others in Ireland who allowed themselves to be deceived by the pledge-breakers. The latter represented that they had got private assurances from the government that a new era was about to begin in the administration of Ireland, that the Emancipation Act was going to be something more than a mere legal statute, and that the interests of Ireland would be safe in the hands of the new Cabinet.

* Duffy, *League of the North and South*, p. 220.
† Morley, *Life of Gladstone*, Vol. I., p. 444.

Sadleir was defeated at Carlow, but Keogh, by the aid of a section of the clergy and of the bishop of Elphin, secured his election at Athlone. Naturally, the number of defections from the party increased in such circumstances, and the tone of the *Nation* and the *Tablet* against Dr. Cullen, who had become archbishop of Dublin in 1852, and who, by his silence, was regarded as friendly to the pledge-breakers, became more outspoken. The Northern Leaguers, who went over to London to watch the interests of the tenants, showed, too, that they placed more reliance on Keogh and his party than on Duffy, Lucas and their friends. Even Sharman-Crawford approved of the action of the deserters; while, at the same time, the League was bitterly assailed by Mitchell in his paper in New York. A conference of the League was called in Dublin in the autumn of 1853, and the resolutions condemning the deserters and upholding the policy of independent opposition were renewed against the wishes of the Northern delegates, who thereupon seceded from the association. The same sickening scenes of wholesale defection and of approval of such action were witnessed in 1854. At the conference held in that year no Presbyterian delegates appeared. The few priests and tenants' representatives present re-affirmed the position of the League, and determined to hold a series of county meetings in order to rouse the country. The first of these was fixed for Callan in the county Kilkenny, and the bishop of Ossory forbade Father O'Keefe from attending the meeting. Duffy and Lucas and a large number of the clergy, including the archdeacon of Ossory, addressed the meeting. Lucas announced his intention of appealing to Rome against the new policy of forbidding the priests to take part in political and social struggles.

It was confidently asserted by Lucas and Duffy and by a large body of their clerical supporters, that Dr. Cullen was principally responsible for the failure of the independent opposition policy, that he favoured a Whig

alliance, and that by his silence as well as by his positive encouragement he was assisting the men who had broken their pledges. Such charges sound strange at first sight, especially when it is remembered that while rector of the Irish College Dr Cullen had been the implacable enemy of English influence in Irish ecclesiastical affairs, that when he came to Ireland as archbishop of Armagh and Apostolic Delegate he refused to hold the National Synod at Maynooth because it was a government institution, and that in the House of Commons, and outside it, he was charged by the Prime Minister* and the Lord Lieutenant † with being an agitator and a supporter of communism.‡ It was undoubtedly true that the scenes witnessed by Dr. Cullen during his last years in Rome, when Pius IX. was driven from his capital by the very men he had amnestied, and whose wishes he had endeavoured to meet by reasonable concessions, made him cautious in regard to popular agitation. Nor can it be denied that he was desirous of seeing the clergy mix less in political affairs, especially at a time when various parties and policies were struggling for supremacy, and when the clergy must necessarily alienate some of their flocks by active participation in politics. He distrusted Duffy on account of his action in 1848 as both dangerous and incompetent, and the attitude adopted by Duffy and the *Nation* during the agitation on the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill did not tend to allay his suspicions. It was pointed out to him that the Peelites, who had alone resisted the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, had secured the principal voice in the Aberdeen Cabinet, and he probably believed with Sharman-Crawford and many others that more might be gained by an alliance with such a party than by the policy of opposition.

But his neglect to speak out openly against the pledge-breakers as the archbishop of Tuam had done, and the active support given by some of the other bishops to the Whig Catholic candidates, were deeply resented, and

* *Hansard*, CLXXX., pp. 187-91.
† Letter from Lord Lieutenant to Lord Shrewsbury.
‡ *League of the North and South*, pp. 172-3.

the prohibition against certain priests taking part in politics, coming at such a time, gave colour to the view that he meant to use the whole influence of the Church against the policy of independent opposition. Hence, the appeal of Lucas to Rome was warmly supported by a large section of the bishops and clergy. For so far the issues were clear, and Lucas was assisted in the preparation of his case by some of the ablest ecclesiastics in Ireland.

When Lucas set out for Rome, however, the *Tablet* was deprived of his assistance, and the articles written by Duffy in the *Nation* were most impolitic. His intemperate attacks were resented by men who thoroughly sympathised with the appeal, and when translated into Italian and submitted to the Roman authorities, were well calculated to confirm the suspicions of Dr. Cullen regarding the aims and objects of Duffy and his friends. Hence, a great many of the clergy dropped out from the contest, and some of the bishops, who had been hitherto neutral or friendly, alarmed at the general attack made upon their body, discountenanced the active co-operation of their clergy in the appeal movement.

Lucas arrived in Rome in December, 1854, and had conferences with Dr. MacHale, Dr. Derry (Clonfert), and Cardinal Wiseman, all of whom gave him support and encouragement. In January he had a long audience with Pius IX., and from the account given by Lucas himself it seemed as if a solution agreeable to all parties could be arrived at. A friendly meeting was arranged by Mgr. Barnabo, secretary of the Propaganda, between Dr. Cullen and Lucas, but no agreement could be secured. Both parties clung pertinaciously to their own views. A memorial in support of Lucas was forwarded signed by George Henry Moore, Richard Swift, Charles Gavan Duffy, John Francis Maguire, Patrick MacMahon, and John Brady, all of whom were members of Parliament.* Lucas set to work on the preparation of a full statement of the case to be presented to the

* *Life of Lucas*, Vol. II., p. 119.

Pope and to the Propaganda, but the effort was too much for him, and before he had finished it he returned to England in failing health. On October the 22nd, 1855, he died. On the day of his funeral Dr. MacHale celebrated a solemn requiem Mass in the cathedral at Tuam for the repose of his soul, and a week later his loyal supporters in Meath, Dr. Cantwell, the bishop, and seventy of his priests assembled at Navan for a similar function. The statement * was left unfinished, and was never presented at Rome. The failure of the Tenants' League, and the consequent dissatisfaction with constitutional agitation, prepared the way for the secret societies, notably for the Fenian movement. The whole incident was most unfortunate, and was calculated to delay for years the formation of an independent party. If measures of redress were to be secured by Parliamentary agitation, it seems obvious enough that the Irish members should hold aloof from English parties, but, at this particular period, very few people in Ireland appeared to have realised the necessity for such a policy.

The Emancipation Act of 1829, and the Tithes Act of 1838 had removed the most glaring of the grievances of which the Irish Catholics complained. But much of the old penal code still remained in regard to the charitable bequests, marriages, exclusion from office, declarations, and "ministers' fees." For all practical purposes the Emancipation Act was treated as a dead letter. The Protestant monopoly of place and power continued with very little limitation. Whether the government in office was Whig or Tory, Catholics were carefully excluded. Twenty years after the passing of the Emancipation Act nine-tenths of all places of emolument or power were in the hands of the dominant minority.† The defence put forward for such an anomalous state of affairs, that Catholics were unfit for such employment, was on a par with the argument

* *Life of Lucas*, Vol. II., pp. 141-405.
† *Hansard*, CLXXX., p. 290.

advanced in defence of jury-packing at the same period, namely, that Catholics could not be trusted even on their oaths in cases where the interests of their co-religionists were concerned.

The Charitable Bequests Act of 1832, and the abolition of many of the penal enactments in 1844 and 1846 were a continuation of the work that had been begun by the Emancipation Act. In several of the Catholic towns of Ireland a tax was levied for the support of the Protestant clergymen, and, even after the Tithe Act of 1838, this tax still remained. The cities and towns in which this odious levy, known as "ministers' money," was still enforced were Dublin, Cork, Limerick, Waterford, Kilkenny, Clonmel, Drogheda and Kinsale. The total amount is variously estimated, but that it was not less than £12,500 was agreed to by all parties. It was enforced under penalty of disfranchisement, and so late as 1850 the furniture of the parish priest of SS. Michael and John's, in Dublin, was seized for non-payment of this tax. Various attempts were made to secure redress, but it was only in 1854, and after a difficult struggle in the House of Commons, that the "ministers' money" was abolished.* Six years later the jurisdiction of the Protestant Ecclesiastical Courts to deal with certain civil cases was abolished. Finally, in 1867, the office of Lord Chancellor of Ireland was thrown open to Catholics; Catholic mayors of cities were legally permitted to appear in Catholic churches in their robes of office, and the insulting declaration against transubstantiation, the invocation of the saints, and the sacrifice of the Mass, which, up to that period, each Lord Lieutenant was obliged to make, was abolished, at least, as regards Protestant occupants of this office.† Lord O'Hagan was shortly afterwards appointed Lord Chancellor.

But so long as the Church of a small minority was recognised as the official Church in Ireland, and so long

* 17 & 18 Vict., c. 11; *Hansard*, Vol. CXCVII.
† 30 & 31 Vict., c. 62.

as it was in possession of immense endowments, derived in great measure from Catholic sources, Irish Catholics could not be silent. The substitution of a rent-charge in place of the tithes, and the abolition of "ministers' money" helped to bolster up the Protestant Church in Ireland for a time, but they could not delay indefinitely its disestablishment. It had in its possession glebe lands, amounting at the period, to 132,756 acres,* together with an annual revenue of £600,000, £400,000 of which was derived from the tithe rent-charge for which both Catholic and Protestant landlords were equally liable. Altogether the property of the Protestant Church in Ireland in 1869 was valued at £16,000,000, the greater part of this having been derived from public sources. The bishops of the Protestant Church in Ireland had been as a rule Englishmen or Scotchmen, and they used their immense revenues to build up landed families in the country. In this way, by blood as well as by religious conviction and interest, the vast majority of the landlord class in Ireland were closely associated with the Established Church.†

In order to remove the reproach of sterility that had been levelled against it, and to show that the Established Church was carrying out the intentions of the English government, which had endowed her with so much wealth, various efforts were made during the century to win over the Irish to Protestantism. It is significant that nearly all these efforts were confined to places where the Catholics were on the verge of starvation, and where motives other than religious conviction were likely to influence a change in their religion. The "New Reformation," begun about 1824, passed away without having made any permanent impression. The *Irish Society*, founded for "the scriptural and religious instruction of Irish Catholics through the medium of their own language," the *Island and Coast Society* for promoting the scriptural education of the people on the islands and coast of Ireland, the *Irish Church Missions*,

* *Essays on the Irish Church*, Dublin, 1866, p. 250.
† Godkin, *Ireland and her Churches*, pp. 526-43.

founded after the famine years (1849), the *West Connaught Church Endowment Society,* established by Dr. Plunket, Protestant archbishop of Tuam, and several kindred societies, devoted all their attention to the province of Connaught. A Protestant settlement was established at Achill. Scripture readers were imported from all parts into the districts, tracts were distributed broadcast, and even ballad-singers were employed to help on the work of conversion. Exaggerated reports of the number of the converts were published in the English newspapers; archbishops, bishops and various dignitaries who visited the districts confirmed the accuracy of these reports, and for a time (1849-1861), many people believed that the Established Church was about to realise the aims of its founders. But when the Census returns of 1861 were published they revealed the fact that most of the supposed converts had no existence, and that the venerable dignitaries whose glaring reports had been read with such interest in England and Scotland, must have allowed themselves to be deceived. Various attempts were made to explain away the official returns, but no amount of quibbling could explain the fact that the Established Church, even though aided by the famine and the wholesale evictions, had made no progress in Ireland since 1834.*

From the publication of the Census of 1861 it was felt on all sides that the state Church in Ireland was doomed. Even its ablest friends had nothing to urge in its defence except that it was one of the great bulwarks of English power in the country, that its official position had been guaranteed by the Act of Union, and that by appropriating the possessions of the Irish Church the very foundations of property in Ireland were being endangered. The different sections of Irish members showed more determination in their discussions of this question, while the carefully compiled statistics prepared by the exertions of Sir John Gray exposed the scandal of the Established Church in a way in which it

* Gladstone, *Hansard,* March, 1868, p. 480.

had never been exposed previously.* The Fenian movement,† too, gave the government serious cause for alarm. From the break up of the Tenants' League in 1855 a large section of the younger men abandoned constitutional agitation as hopeless. O'Mahony and Stephens laboured hard at the organisation of the Fenian Brotherhood. The MacManus funeral in 1861, and the return to Ireland of many of the officers who had served in the American Civil War helped to give the society a strong foothold in Ireland. The leaders were arrested in 1865, and the *Irish People* suppressed. The movement, however, went on. Scattered risings took place in 1867; an attack was planned against Chester Castle; the Manchester rescue was effected; and portion of the Clerkenwell prison blown up by dynamite. The *Habeas Corpus* Act was suspended in Ireland; the gaols were filled with men arrested on the merest suspicion; the troops were held in readiness for a general outbreak; and the Irish coasts were patrolled by gun-boats. Lord Derby and his Cabinet could see no remedy for such a state of affairs except coercion, but fortunately not all the leading English statesmen shared their views.

In March, 1868, John Francis Maguire moved for a committee of the House to consider the state of affairs in Ireland. Disraeli refused to admit the existence of any serious grievances, but Gladstone adopted a very different tone. He declared that so long as Irishmen were confronted by the spirit or by the remaining institutions of a hostile ascendency, and so long as they did not enjoy complete security for the fruits of their industry and labour, there could be no contentment or peace in the country. The Irish Church, he said, as a state Church must cease to exist.

A fortnight later (23rd March) Gladstone followed up his speech by giving notice of three resolutions which he was about to submit to the House. These were, that the Established Church in Ireland should be disestab-

* *Freeman's Journal Commission*, Dublin, 1868.

† O'Leary, *Fenians and Fenianism*, London, 1896. Fitzgibbon, *Ireland in* 1868, London, 1868. Sigerson, *Modern Ireland*, London, 1868.

lished, that, pending the final decision of Parliament, no new interests should be created, and that the queen should be requested to place at the disposal of Parliament her interest in the temporalities of the archbishoprics, bishoprics, ecclesiastical dignities and benefices in Ireland. These resolutions were passed by large majorities, but were rejected by the House of Lords (29th June, 1868). On the 11th November Parliament was dissolved, and the new elections were fought almost exclusively on the question of disestablishment and land reform in Ireland. The Liberals were completely victorious, and Gladstone was called upon to form a Cabinet (December, 1868).

He endeavoured to induce the Protestant bishops in Ireland to come to terms, but they indignantly refused to have any part in such "confiscation" and "sacrilege." Nevertheless, he pushed forward the preparation of his measure, and on the 1st March, 1869, he introduced the bill for the disestablishment of the Irish Church. The discussions on the different stages occupied a considerable time, but in May the bill was read for a third time in the House of Commons by a majority of 114. Meanwhile, the measure was denounced in the general synods and at Protestant meetings held throughout Ireland. The Lords were relied upon to defend the threatened institution, and for a time it looked as if the trust of the extreme Protestant party was not misplaced. But by the personal intervention of the queen, the bill was allowed to pass the second reading. In the committee stages various amendments were introduced, but except in a few particulars the House of Commons refused to agree to the proposed changes. The Lords were finally induced to give way, and on the 26th July, 1869, the measure received the royal assent.*

The Disestablishment Act † was to come into force in

* Morley, *Life of Gladstone*, Vol. II., pp. 241-80.

† For the working of the Disestablishment Act, *cf. Hansard* for year 1869. *Report of the Commissioners of Church Temporalities in Ireland for the period* 1869-1880, Dublin, 1880. *Annual Reports of the Representative Body of the Church of Ireland*, Dublin.

January, 1871, and from that date the Protestant Episcopalian Church in Ireland was no longer to be regarded as the state Church. Its bishops lost their seats in Parliament. The property of the Church became the property of the state, subject, of course, to life interests, and a body, known as the Commissioners of Church Temporalities in Ireland, was set up to administer it. Power was given to create a new ecclesiastical corporation under the title of the Church Representative Body to take possession of the property which the state would return for the use of the disestablished Church. The cathedrals, churches, burial grounds, schoolhouses, with all the plate, furniture and movable chattels, were placed at the disposal of the Representative Body. The sites of the rectories, with the gardens and outhouses, were sold to the Church at ten years' purchase. To each rectory 10 acres, and to each episcopal palace 30 acres, were to be assigned to the Church Body at a price to be fixed by agreement between the Church Body and the Commissioners. Only one-fourth of this was to be paid immediately, the remainder, capital and interest, was repayable in 64 instalments. The glebe houses, which had cost £1,200,000, and for the repairs and extension of which £250,000 had been lent by the state, were given up to the Church body free of cost in cases where there was no building charge, and where there was such a charge the Representative Body was to pay the charge, or ten times the yearly valuation of the house and site, whichever was the less. Gladstone spoke of this as only "a nominal charge," and the Report of the Church Temporalities proved that his statement was correct. The vested interests of the bishops, rectors, curates, patrons of benefices, schoolmasters, precentors, vergers and grave-diggers were secured by the law, and sufficient capital was handed over to meet all such claims. It was of great importance to the Church Representative Body that the clergy should commute their claims into life annuities, and to induce them to do so a bonus of 12 per cent. on the total was offered them.

From this source the Representative Body received about £7,500,000, and by careful investments of this capital, which even at 3½ was sufficient to meet all claims, together with the profits derived from composition with the clergy, the Church Body has been able to realise immense profits. In addition to all this, £500,000 was allowed as compensation for private endowments although Gladstone computed they were not worth more than half that sum.*

Hence, it is clear that the Church of the minority in Ireland was generously treated in 1869. In addition to the churches, schoolhouses, glebes, cemeteries &c., it received from the state directly or indirectly close on £10,000,000, and though this amount was heavily charged with life interests, yet the repayments were arranged in such a way as to permit the Church Body to derive large profits from the transaction, and, thus, to have in hands, after the payment of all charges, the nucleus of a fresh endowment.†

The Presbyterians received from the funds of the Church about £768,000 as a compensation for the annual *Regium Donum* grants, while Maynooth College was awarded a capital sum of about £370,000. Thus, even in the very act of disestablishment, the Catholics forming 74 per cent. of the population were pointedly reminded that in Ireland religious equality had a peculiar signification in the mouth of even such a liberal English statesman as Gladstone. The remainder of the £16,000,000, after all claims of Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Catholics were satisfied, was set aside for the relief of public suffering and distress in Ireland according to the discretion of Parliament. But a great deal of this amount was spent on other purposes, notably the teachers' pensions scheme, the Royal University, the Congested Districts Board, the Department of Agriculture, and the payment of arrears of rent.

* *Hansard*, Vol. CXCVIII., p. 21.
† *Idem.*, Vol. CXCVI., pp. 323-33.

CHAPTER III

EDUCATION IN IRELAND

(*a*) Primary Education

Report of the Education Commissioners, 1810 (Reprinted 1821). *Report of the Commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry*, 1825-1826. *Report of Select Committee on Plan of Education (Ireland)*, 1835-37. *Report of Endowed Schools' Commission*, 1879-1881. *Report of the Royal Commission (Powis) on Irish Primary Education*, 9 vols., 1870. *Annual Reports of the Commissioners of National Education (Ireland)*, 1833-1908. *Report of Mr. Dale*, 1904. O'Brien, *Fifty Years of Concessions to Ireland*, Vol. I., pp. 13-217. Walsh, *Statement of the Chief Grievances of Irish Catholics in the Matter of Education*, Dublin, 1890. Godkin, *Education in Ireland*, London, 1862. Moore, *An Unwritten Chapter in the History of Education (The History of Kildare Street Society)*, London, 1904. Butt, *The Problem of Irish Education*, London, 1875. Kavanagh, *The Catholic Case Stated*, Dublin, 1859. Graham-Balfour, *Educational Systems of Great Britain and Ireland*, Oxford, 1898. Whately, *Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately*, 2 vols., London, 1866.

The history of Irish primary education during the latter portion of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth is almost entirely taken up with the efforts of proselytising societies to destroy Catholicity in Ireland by capturing the education of the children. While the Catholics were either forbidden to erect schools, or prevented from doing so by legal restrictions, by the resistance of the landowners, and by general poverty and depression, immense sums of money were placed at the disposal of the proselytising societies by individuals and by Parliament, with the aim of uprooting the Catholic religion. In some cases the objects were professed openly, in other cases proselytism was concealed under some specious name, but in nearly

every instance the fears of Irish Catholics were amply justified.

The parochial schools, ordered to be established by Henry VIII. for the purpose of teaching English and Protestantism, did not increase rapidly till the reign of Queen Anne. The rectors of the parishes were supposed to pay for the maintenance of the schools out of their large revenues, but in most cases they transferred the burthen to the parents of the children. In 1788, there were 361 of these schools, and in 1810 about 549, most of which were situated in the province of Ulster. These establishments were professedly Protestant, and, as such were shunned by the Catholics. The Diocesan Free Schools were founded by order of Elizabeth in 1570, but the bishops seem not to have been willing to co-operate generously with her majesty in making grants of land for the support of these institutions. In 1810, there were only 18 of these in existence, and since that time most of them have disappeared. The Endowed Schools of James I. should be treated rather in connection with secondary education.

In 1657, Erasmus Smith, who had received large tracts of land in Ireland under Cromwell, made a grant of portion of these for the establishment of free Grammar Schools. It was ordered after the Restoration that religious instruction should be given according to the principles of the Established Church. The first three schools were established at Galway, Drogheda, and Tipperary, but as the funds increased other schools were established at Ennis and Nenagh, and a few primary schools were also founded by the trustees. Between 1808 and 1815 sixty-nine primary schools were erected in different parts of the country, and were conducted on strictly Protestant principles. Later on, however, the religious instruction ceased to be obligatory, and the reading of the Scriptures was alone prescribed. The reports on these schools in 1854 were very unfavourable.

In 1733, at the instigation of Primate Boulter, an "Incorporated Society for promoting English Protes-

tant Schools in Ireland" * was established for the purpose of weaning the Catholics from "Popery." The schools set up by this body were known as Charter Schools, the first of which was opened at Castledermot, in the County Kildare in 1735. Large sums of money were provided by private subscriptions, the king having guaranteed an annual sum of £1,000. In 1747, the Irish Parliament took the Charter Schools under its protection, and from that year till the Irish Parliament ceased to exist in 1801 assistance was freely voted for these professedly proselytising institutions. Nor did the Imperial Parliament adopt a more liberal course. The grant was continued till the year 1832, when it was stopped. From its establishment till its official disendowment the Incorporated Society received from the Irish or Imperial Parliament for its Charter Schools £1,027,715. The Charter Schools aimed only at educating Catholic children. The teachers were Protestants, the books Protestant, the religious instruction Protestant, and before children could be accepted the unfortunate parents were obliged to sign an agreement that they wished them to be reared as Protestants.

In addition to all this the schools were frightfully mismanaged. Owing to the reports of John Howard in 1784 and 1787 a committee of inquiry was appointed, and the evidence revealed the existence of such abuses and inhumanity that it was confidently expected the Irish Parliament would withdraw its assistance from the Charter Schools. But these expectations were not realised. The Irish Parliament continued its subsidies, and the Imperial Parliament adopted the same attitude. Another Commission (1824-1825) reported more unfavourably still, and recommended Parliament to discontinue grants from public funds. The recommendation was, however, disregarded, and it was only in 1832 that the Parliamentary subsidy was discontinued.

* For Charter Schools, *cf.* Froude, *The English in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, 3 vols., London, 1872, Vols. I., II. Lecky, *History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. I., pp. 233-38. *Reports of Royal Commissioners of* 1825, 1854.

In addition to the Charter Schools the Hibernian Military School was established on strictly Protestant principles in 1769 for the education of the children of soldiers in Ireland, the Hibernian Marine School for the education of marines (1775), and in 1792 the "Association for Discountenancing Vice and Promoting the Knowledge and Practice of the Christian Religion." It, too, proposed to combine instruction in the doctrine and principles of the Established Church with secular education, and in 1801 received its first grant from the Imperial Parliament. In order to better secure Catholic support the rules were modified in 1806. The Catholic children in attendance were not obliged to be present at religious instruction, but the reading of the bible was obligatory on all. In some of the schools Catholic teachers were appointed, the rules of the society were not enforced, and, as a consequence, large numbers of Catholics began to avail themselves of the schools. In 1824, out of a total of 15,922 children in attendance, 6,344 were Catholics. From 1801 till 1824 the society received from public funds £80,000.

But once the founders of the association perceived that the Catholics were receiving secular education without any injury to their religious beliefs they adopted a different attitude. Some of the Catholic teachers were dismissed, tracts of a most controversial character were put in circulation, and in a few districts an openly proselytising campaign was initiated. As a result, the Catholics were alarmed. Dr. Doyle issued a strong letter on the proselytising schools and pamphlets, and the Catholic children were withdrawn.

The London Hibernian Society was founded in 1806 to "promote pure religion" in Ireland. For a while it succeeded in securing the attendance of some Catholic children, but in a few years the teachers began to show their colours, and to become active agents for the spread of Protestantism. The Baptist Society was founded with a similar purpose in 1814, and the Irish Society for promoting the education of the native Irish through the

medium of their "own language" in 1818. This latter body was generously assisted by the British and Foreign Bible Association and the London Hibernian Society. These bodies spent as much as £80,000 in publishing the bible in Irish and in scattering it broadcast through the Irish-speaking districts.

While all these bodies, richly endowed from public or private sources, were at work to secure the Catholic children very little could be done by the Catholics themselves to set up a proper system of education. Till 1782 Catholic schoolmasters were liable to heavy penalties if they undertook to exercise their profession, and, according to the terms of the Act of Relief passed that year, no Catholic was permitted to open a school without having previously secured the licence of the Protestant bishop of the district. This licence might be refused or recalled. In 1792, it was provided that such licences must be given by the bishop or a magistrate whenever a demand was made, and, in consequence of this large numbers of Catholic schools were established. In many of the remote parts of the country the Catholic schools had continued to exist in open disregard of the laws, but from this time, even in the large cities, Catholic schools multiplied. Religious orders of women were founded. The Presentation Sisters opened schools in Cork, Dublin, Waterford, the Poor Clares in Dublin, the Sisters of St. Bridgid (1807) in Kildare. The Christian Brothers were established in Waterford by Edmond Rice in 1802, and soon began to extend the field of their operations. In many districts, especially where there was grave danger of proselytism, Catholic schools were founded by local subscriptions. Still, owing to the poverty of their body, the opposition of the landlords, and the want of competent teachers, the schools of the Catholics were utterly inadequate to supply the wants of the Catholic population.*

Hence, when it was proposed to found a new education society which would abandon the policy of prosely-

* Newenham, *State of Ireland*, Dublin, 1809.

tism and attend solely to education, many Catholics gave their adhesion to the movement. In 1811, the "Society for promoting the education of the poor in Ireland," afterwards known as the Kildare Street Society, was established. In a short time Parliament voted large annual grants (£30,000), and great numbers of schools were opened in different parts of the country. O'Connell joined the board of direction, as did also the Duke of Leinster and Lord Cloncurry. But though nominally unsectarian, yet out of a total of 32 members composing the board, only two were Catholics, and in the appointment of teachers the Catholics were treated with almost equal unfairness. The bible was to be read in each school without note or comment, and no attempt was to be made to interfere with the religious beliefs of the Catholic children. Many Catholics distrusted the Kildare Street Society from the beginning. They disliked the principles upon which it was founded, and they feared that, like the other Irish educational bodies, it would soon throw off the mask and begin the work of proselytism. In 1820, when the society began to connect itself with the Hibernian Association, the Baptist Society and the Society for discountenancing vice, it was clear that these fears were being realised. Dr. MacHale, then professor in Maynooth, began a vigorous onslaught on the Kildare Street schools in a series of letters written over the name *Hierophilos*. O'Connell, the Duke of Leinster, and Lord Cloncurry retired from the board, and the schools were denounced by the bishops and clergy. Parliament, however, took no notice of their protests, and the grant from public funds was continued. In 1831, the grant was finally withdrawn.

According to the returns made in 1824 there were then in Ireland 11,823 schools, with a staff of 12,530 teachers, and an attendance of 560,549 children. The Society for discountenancing vice controlled 167 of these schools, the Erasmus Smith Trustees 100, the Kildare Street Society 583, the London Hibernian Society 390,

the Baptist Society 71, the Charter Schools or Incorporated Society 32, the Irish Society, the London Missionary Society, the Irish Evangelical Society, the Ladies' Hibernian Society, the British and Irish Ladies' Society, Regimental and Gaol Schools, 123. As against these, the Sisters belonging to various religious orders had charge of 46 schools, the Christian Brothers 24, and the Catholic clergy maintained out of private subscription 352 schools.* These figures are sufficient to show how dangerous was the state of affairs at the period, and how the Catholic bishops had good reason to be willing to accept a system, which, though not perfect, might give them some guarantee against such a multiplication of proselytising agencies.

In 1819, Cardinal Fontana directed the attention of Dr. Bray, Archbishop of Cashel, to the various attempts that were being made to proselytise the children by means of the schools, and he exhorted the Irish bishops to establish Catholic schools.† The bishops, notably Dr. Doyle, made great efforts to remedy the evil. In 1824, they presented a petition in favour of grants for purely Catholic education. In 1826, when proposals were made to them for the establishment of a state system of primary schools, they insisted that the teachers should be Catholic in Catholic districts, that in mixed districts some of the teachers should be Catholic, that training colleges might be erected in the different provinces, that the religious books be selected by the bishops, who should also have a veto on the other books used. Without at least these guarantees they declared that they would refuse to consider any state system as satisfactory.‡

The concession of Catholic Emancipation in 1829 was an admission that all hopes of winning over the Catholics *en masse* to Protestantism were gone, and the

* *Second Report of the Commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry*, 1826, pp. 1-24.

† Renehan, Vol. I., p. 384.

‡ Cullen, *Pastoral Letters and other Writings*, Vol. II., p. 533.

strength of the Catholic movement made it necessary to make some concession. In 1831, Mr. Stanley, then Chief Secretary in Ireland, proposed and carried the establishment of the national schools. The object of the new system was to supply education to the children of the poor in schools open to both Catholics and Protestants, but conducted in such a way as to exclude even the suspicion of proselytism. In these schools the education during four days of the week was to be purely literary and moral, and for one or two days they were to be open for separate religious instruction. The Lord Lieutenant was to name a board representative of the different religious bodies, and to this board was to be entrusted the entire working of the system. The board was appointed in December. It consisted of seven members, only two of whom were Catholics, Dr. Murray, Archbishop of Dublin, and Mr. Blake. Dr. Whately, the Protestant archbishop of Dublin, and Rev. Mr. Carlile, who was the first Central Commissioner, were the most influential men on the board. 1831

The members of the Established Church attacked the system from the beginning because it excluded the bible from the schools. The Presbyterians represented by the Synod of Ulster were hardly less violent in their opposition, and insisted that several important changes should be introduced. The books for use were edited by Mr. Carlile with the aid of Dr. Whately, and though attacked by the Protestants, they could hardly be represented in fairness as being either too Catholic or too Irish. The majority of the Catholics were not unwilling to give the new system a trial, more especially as it was a great improvement on anything that had been offered hitherto. Dr. MacHale, however, did not share in these views, but owing to the approval given to the national schools by Dr. Murray, Dr. Doyle, and O'Connell, he was unwilling at first to declare publicly his opposition. Seeing, however, that the Presbyterian Synod of Ulster was gradually changing the system to suit its own wishes, he addressed a letter to Lord John Russell

(1838),* in which he attacked the "mixed principle" as being opposed to the wishes of all parties in Ireland. He pointed out, too, that though the Catholics formed five-sixths of the population, yet out of seven members on the board of national education only two were Catholics, and that the whole work was confided to Mr. Carlile, a former official of the Bible Societies, and Dr. Whately, the author of *The Errors of Romanism*, neither of whom were likely to command the confidence of Irish Catholics. The *Lessons of Christianity* prepared by Dr. Whately for use in the schools, were also justly condemned. Dr. MacHale refused to allow the national schools to be established in his diocese, and in their place he made a vigorous effort to organise a system of free schools which might be at the same time both Catholic and Irish.†

The majority of the bishops did not, however, agree with Dr. MacHale's unqualified condemnation of the schools. The case was referred to Rome, but the Roman authorities preferred that the question should be settled in Ireland. In 1840, the bishops met in Dublin, and a committee of their body was appointed to present to the Lord Lieutenant a statement of their demands. These demands, moderate as they were, were refused, but even still eighteen of the bishops petitioned Rome against the condemnation. In 1841, the expected decision arrived. The schools were not condemned. It was left to the individual bishops to decide whether the national system should be introduced into their dioceses or excluded. The bishops were, however, warned not to permit books dangerous to Catholic faith to be used, and they were to see that the school property should be vested in themselves or their clergy.‡ The latter point was of importance in view of a decision arrived at by the board in 1845. Till then the schools were vested in trustees, but, acccording to

* Reilly, Vol. I., Chap. XXII.

† *Idem.*, Vol. I., pp. 469-76.

‡ *Acta et Decreta Synodi Habitae apud Maynutiam*, 1900, Appendix pp. 327-31.

the new decision, the schools to which building grants had been made should be vested in the board. In view of the Roman decision Catholics were united in their opposition to the new rule, but could only secure that its application would not be retrospective. The schools built in the future from public grants should become the property of the board. This rule was modified at a later period. The death of Dr. Crolly of Armagh in 1849, and the appointment of Dr. Cullen to the primatial see in the same year, marked a new stage in the history of the Irish national schools. The new primate was the inflexible opponent of mixed education, and though the synod of Thurles did not condemn the national schools it merely tolerated them. The death of Dr. Murray in 1852 removed the strongest supporter the national system had amongst the Irish episcopate. It was fortunate that at that time the see of Dublin was filled by the promotion of Dr. Cullen. The National Board, mainly at the instigation of the Ulster Presbyterians, was abandoning, one by one, the safeguards proposed by Mr. Stanley against proselytism. In 1840, the Ulster Synod succeeded in securing the exclusion of the Catholic clergy from the schools founded by the Presbyterians. In 1842, they had the rule amended which permitted religious instruction in the schools for one day per week. The book, *Lessons on the Truth of Christianity*, written by Dr. Whately, was amended on the suggestion of Dr. Murray, but was still highly objectionable, and in 1843 another book, *Christian Evidences,* written by the same author, was adopted for use in the national schools. Till 1850 these books were confined principally to Protestant schools, but, in the latter year, an effort was made to secure their general adoption. This attempt was resisted by the Catholics as encouraging proselytism, and in response to their protests the commissioners were obliged to prohibit the use of these books for the future. Again, the rule by which managers and teachers were obliged to exclude Catholic children from Protestant religious instruction,

and Protestant children from Catholic religious instruction, was abolished in 1847. In consequence of this change, in many of the schools in the North of Ireland controlled by Presbyterians, and in many schools in other parts of Ireland where the Protestant landlords had control, the Catholic children were encouraged to be present at the Protestant religious instruction. These attempts at proselytism were reported to the board by one of their own inspectors, but nothing was done to put an end to such an abuse. The report was, in fact, suppressed, but the evidence on the point from other sources was so overpowering that the existence of the evil could not be denied.*

These facts convinced the Catholics that a mixed system could not be trusted, and from this time forward they set themselves determinedly to insist upon strictly denominational education. The report of 1860 showed clearly that the mixed system was disliked by the great body of the people in Ireland.

Out of a total of 5,411 schools, 2,496 were attended exclusively by children of one religious denomination, and were in fact, though not in theory, denominational. Catholics and Protestant Episcopalians demanded that the board should yield to the wishes of the majority of the people. But the board refused to give way. In response, however, to a joint letter of the Irish bishops in 1860 the number of commissioners was increased to twenty, ten of whom were Catholics, the rule obliging managers who wished to secure building grants to vest the schools in the board was amended, a revision of the school books so as to exclude books objectionable to Catholics was undertaken, and a promise was made that the number of model schools should not be increased.

The bishops were not, however, satisfied with changes which left the root of the evil untouched, and which prevented the Christian Brothers and other religious bodies from sharing in the grants for primary education. In a letter, addressed to Sir George Grey in 1866, they demanded that in schools attended by pupils of one re-

* O'Brien, Vol. I., pp. 202-3.

ligious denomination all restrictions upon religious instruction should be removed, and that the government should recognise the fact that these schools were denominational.* The letter was forwarded to the National Education Board for a reply, but the board declined to enter into any discussion raised by the bishops. The bishops renewed their demands in 1867, and a Royal Commission was appointed to examine the question in 1868. This commission, presided over by the Earl of Powis, consisted of fourteen members, seven of whom were Catholics and seven Protestants, and having examined representatives of the different interests concerned they presented their report in 1870. They declared that in districts where there was only one school that school should be open to members of all religious denominations, but that where there were several schools equally accessible to children of different denominations, such schools should be regarded as denominational schools.† Though the Irish bishops have continued to demand that the decision of this commission should be carried out, the authorities still insist on maintaining the mixed system with its restrictions upon religious education. In practice, however, the number of mixed schools has steadily decreased since that time. According to the report of 1907-8, 5,951 schools with an attendance of 482,804 pupils were exclusively Catholic or Protestant, while only 2,580 schools with an attendance of 192,052 pupils were attended by both Catholics and Protestants. Again, while in 1882 the percentage of unmixed schools in Ulster was only 26.3, in Munster 62.3, in Leinster 52.9, in Connaught 57.5, and in all Ireland 46.0, in 1907 the percentage of unmixed schools in Ulster had risen to 60.5, in Munster to 76.8, in Leinster to 70.9, in Connaught to 78.3, and in all Ireland to 69.8. During the same period the number of mixed schools in all Ireland had fallen from 54.0 to 30.2.‡

* Walsh, pp. 36-40.
† *Idem.*, pp. 46-7.
‡ Report 1908, pp. 18-21.

As an essential part of the system it was arranged that the teachers should be trained in colleges erected for the purpose, and a beginning was made to carry out this system in 1834. In 1838, the Central Model Schools were opened in Marlborough Street, and in 1842 Talbot Street was opened as the residence for female teachers. These schools were staffed almost exclusively by Protestants and foreigners, and from the very beginning were a source of anxiety to the bishops. In 1846, the board drew up a scheme for the establishment of 32 district model schools, which were intended, according to the founders to promote united education, to give example to the surrounding schools of the best methods of literary and scientific instruction, and to educate young persons for the office of teacher. Unlike the other schools, the model schools were to remain entirely under the control of the board. These institutions were strenuously opposed by both Catholics and Episcopalians, but were supported by the Presbyterians. In spite, however, of the protests of the bishops and the resolutions passed by them at different times against the model schools, the board persisted in its scheme. In 1862, the bishops passed resolutions prohibiting the clergy from sending teachers to be trained in these schools, or from employing any teachers who had received their training in these institutions, and in their letter to the government in 1866 they renewed their protests against the model schools. In reply to their demands the Chief Secretary, Mr. Fortescue, addressed a letter to the board forbidding them to establish new model schools. In addition to the Central Model Schools in Marlborough Street, and the auxiliary establishments in Dublin, there were at that period 26 model schools in various districts in Ireland.

The model schools having been condemned by the bishops were deserted in great measure by Catholic children and Catholic pupil teachers. In addition to the £113,358 spent on Marlborough Street, together with an annual expense of £8,245, the model schools

had cost from their establishment in 1867, £411,300. Yet the Royal Commission of 1868 considered that the commissioners were not justified in maintaining them, and recommended that the district model schools should be gradually discontinued. The report was, however, neglected. In 1908, there were still 30 model schools with a total of 8,624 pupils in attendance.

As a result of the condemnation of the model schools by the bishops, the majority of the Catholic teachers were untrained. In 1866, out of a total of 7,472 teachers, 4,309 were untrained. Hence, the Chief Secretary suggested that denominational training colleges should be established, and that the rules in the central training colleges should be arranged so as to allow pupils to lodge outside the establishment. The board accepted this suggestion, but a change in the ministry prevented the introduction of these reforms. The Royal Commission of 1868 recommended that in Marlborough Street the scholars of different religions should be lodged in separate boarding-houses, under the care of pastors of their own religion, that denominational training colleges established by religious bodies should be recognised, and that the National Board should be empowered to contribute to their support a sum not exceeding three-fourths of the total cost of maintenance. These recommendations were not carried out.

In 1883, the Chief Secretary again called the attention of the Commissioners of National Education to the necessity of making some more fitting arrangements for the training of teachers. He pointed out that 66 per cent. of the teachers were untrained, and that the government were prepared to contribute to the maintenance of denominational training colleges as was done in England.

A Catholic training college for male teachers was established at Drumcondra in Dublin, but the cost for the site, building, and equipment was supplied from private resources, or borrowed from the Board of Works. The new college, thus heavily handicapped, was obliged to compete with Marlborough Street, built and lavishly

endowed out of public funds. A similar school for girls, established in Baggot Street, Dublin, was recognised in 1883. The inequality between the treatment meted out to the mixed training college at Marlborough Street and to these two Catholic institutions has been rendered more palpable by the fact that since 1904 £45,722 has been expended in providing a new residence for the male pupils in Marlborough Street, and the Commissioners demand an additional grant for providing a similar residence for the female pupils. A Catholic training college was established at Waterford in 1891, in Belfast for girls in 1900, and in Limerick in 1901. The grants to these two latter places are miserably inadequate. In the year 1907-8, over £73,000 were spent on the training colleges. Of this sum Marlborough Street, with its 384 pupils, received £25,894, the Church of Ireland Training College, with its 137 pupils, £7,157, and the five Catholic training colleges, with their 865 pupils, received only about £31,000.*

(*b*) Secondary Education

In addition to the works cited above, *cf.*:—*The Reports of the Commissioners of Intermediate Education, Ireland*, 1879-1908. *Irish Census Report*, 1871.

As in primary education, so, also, in secondary education, the Protestant minority in Ireland enjoyed immense advantages in comparison with the Catholic majority. They had, in the first place, a university, upon which they could rely for a sufficient number of qualified teachers, and, in the second place, they were in possession of schools and educational endowments supplied for the most part by the state. The Diocesan Free Schools, founded by Elizabeth in 1570, and for the maintenance of which the grand juries in Ireland were empowered to lexy taxes, were reserved exclusively for Protestants. They failed, however, in doing the work

* Report, 1907-8.

for which they were established. In 1810, there were only 18 of these establishments, with a total of 380 pupils; in 1857, the number had fallen to 14, and in 1881, there were only three of them in existence, and these were in a state of decay.

The Royal Free Schools of James I. were lavishly endowed out of the confiscated lands, principally situated in Ulster. Four schools were established about 1621, but though the king seems to have done his best to promote their success his efforts were frustrated in some cases by those anxious to appropriate the endowments. Charles I. was anxious to further the undertaking begun by his father, as was also the Restoration government, but the schools failed to attract a large number of pupils. In 1791, there were only 211 pupils in attendance, in 1857 about 311, and in 1879, about 380. Most of the pupils belonged to the Established Church. The seven free schools in existence in 1881 were Armagh, Dungannon, Enniskillen, Raphoe, Cavan, Banagher, and Carysfort.

In addition, the Protestants had at their disposal the schools known as the Erasmus Smith Schools. These were situated at Drogheda, Ennis, Galway, and Tipperary. The trustees of these schools had immense sums at their disposal. Yet in 1856 there were only 160 pupils on the rolls, 128 of those belonging to the Established Church, and in 1880 only 244. The Protestants had, besides, Foyle College, Derry, which was founded in 1814 at a cost of £13,000, raised by contributions by the London Companies and by grants from the grand jury of the county. It enjoyed also a grant from the Royal Endowed Schools fund till 1869, when the grant was discontinued. The Coleraine Academical Institute was founded and supported by grants from the London companies and from private subscriptions. The Londonderry Academical Institute was also supported largely by the Irish Society. St. Columba's College, Dublin, and the Methodist College, Belfast, were practically the only secondary educational establishments

dependent upon private resources, and they were nearly the only ones reported as satisfactory by the Commission of 1880.

It is difficult to estimate the amount of money at the disposal of the various Protestant bodies for the support and maintenance of secondary schools. But in 1857, according to the report of the Commissioners, there were 75,000 acres of land, producing a nett annual income of £37,564, £16,391 from trust funds, and school premises of annual value of £14,615. In addition to this there were various other private grants with which the Commissioners had no power to deal.* Nearly all these funds were at the disposal of the Protestants, and a large share of them appropriated to the support of their secondary schools.

While the Protestants, who formed by far the wealthiest class in the community, were in the enjoyment of such resources, the Catholics were obliged to build up by private subscriptions a system of secondary schools. Once the law permitted them to found such establishments, colleges were erected in different parts of Ireland. In most of the dioceses secondary schools were opened to serve both as seminaries for the training of the clergy and for the higher education of students preparing for a secular profession. The religious orders, notably the Jesuits, the Fathers of the Holy Ghost, and the Vincentians, founded flourishing colleges, while the various teaching congregations of nuns made provision for the secondary education of Catholic girls. From the nature of the case it is difficult to arrive at an exact estimate of the amount of money spent by Catholics on the erection and maintenance of their secondary schools during the century. In the returns undertaken by Sir John Gray in 1868 he calculated that £309,018 had been spent on the erection of 41 seminaries and colleges, that £1,061,025 had been expended upon the establishment of convents and convent schools, some of which, however, should rather be classed as primary schools, and

* Godkin, *Education in Ireland*, p. 159.

£70,000 on the erection of the Christian Brothers' schools. The average annual cost for the maintenance of these establishments he calculated as £250,000.*

Notwithstanding the difficulties under which the Catholics laboured for want of endowments, and for want of a university which might supply trained teachers and open up a career for the more promising students, yet their schools increased and prospered, while many of the Protestant educational establishments showed evident signs of decay. The Census Commissioners in their report in 1871 noted with astonishment that while the number of Catholics receiving intermediate education had gone up, the number of pupils belonging to the class who were in the exclusive enjoyment of state subsidy should have considerably decreased in the interval between 1861 and 1871; while, on the other hand, the reports of the Endowed Schools Commissioners in 1854 and in 1881 showed that the state of education in the vast majority of Catholic schools was superior to that given in the most of the richly-endowed Protestant establishments.

The necessity for some state provision for secondary education was admitted on all sides, but owing to the difficulties which had arisen in connection with the primary system, and with university education, neither of the English political parties wished to undertake the work. The publication of the Census Report of 1871, revealing as it did the fact that out of a total population of 5,500,000, only 10,814 boys were receiving any kind of secondary education, and that, besides, the number of secondary schools was rapidly diminishing, made it incumbent upon the government to undertake some remedial legislation. The failure of Mr. Gladstone to secure the passage of his university bill in 1873, and the overthrow of his government, delayed the solution. In 1878, however, Lord Cairns introduced an Intermediate Education Bill.†

* *The Freeman's Journal Commission*, p. 387.
† 41 & 42 Vict., c. 66.

According to the provisions of this measure as passed seven members nominated by the Lord Lieutenant were to constitute "The Intermediate Education Board of Ireland"; and a grant of £1,000,000, taken from the surplus fund of the Established Church, was to be handed over to this board for the administration of the system. The Intermediate Schools were to receive no direct endowment, nor was the board to assume any responsibility in regard to the management and control of the schools. On the other hand, examinations were to be held by the board's examiners at different centres throughout the country, and provision was to be made for the establishment of a system of exhibitions and prizes for students, and for the payment of result fees to teachers. In this way, indirectly at least, the schools might receive financial assistance, and the children of the less wealthy classes might be enabled to receive a secondary education. The schools were not obliged to present their pupils for these examinations.

The Intermediate Act of 1878 was of immense assistance to secondary education in Ireland. But it left the substance of the Catholic grievances unredressed. All the endowments hitherto enjoyed by the Protestant schools were left to them, and the Catholic schools, depending entirely upon private resources, were obliged to compete with these wealthy institutions for the prizes and fees of the Intermediate examinations. Many Catholics believed that a competition in such circumstances, where all the advantages were on one side, was hopeless, and should not be attempted, but the experience of the last thirty years has shown how groundless were these fears.

The system, however, in which the funds of the school and the future of the pupils were almost entirely dependent upon competitive examinations is radically unsound, and could never be regarded as more than a temporary expedient. The appointment of the Educational Endowments Commission in 1885 gave some hope that some better provision might be made for interme-

diate education, and of a more equitable division of the existing endowments amongst Catholic and Protestant schools. But except in the case of the Ulster Royal Endowed Schools, the funds of which were divided equally between the Catholics and the Protestants, very little advantage was derived from the Commission. Although the Commissioners called attention to the inadequacy of the financial assistance, and though they pointed out how the additional money could be obtained by the suppression of the model schools, which had proved a signal failure, their reports were unheeded, and Irish secondary education remains in a very unsatisfactory condition.

(*c*) University Education

Report of the Royal Commission on University Education, 1901-1903. *Report of the Royal Commission on the University of Dublin*, 1853. *Report of the Royal Commission on Trinity College and the University of Dublin*, 1906. Walsh, *The Irish University Question*, 1897. *Statement of the Chief Grievances of Irish Catholics in the matter of Primary, Intermediate and University Education*, Dublin, 1890. *Trinity College and the University of Dublin*, Dublin, 1902. Stubbs, *The History of the University of Dublin*, Dublin, 1889. Heron, *The Constitutional History of the University of Dublin*, Dublin, 1847. Hogan, *Irish Catholics and Trinity College*, Dublin, 1906. Godkin, *Education in Ireland*, London, 1862. Butt, *The Problem of Irish Education*, London, 1875.

Trinity College, which was founded in 1592, was reserved for Protestants. Till 1793, though Catholics were not expressly excluded, still they could not be admitted to degrees, scholarships, or fellowships in the college without subscribing to a form of oath which no Catholic could conscientiously take. Besides, as students, they were supposed to conform to the discipline and religious practices of the establishment. The Act of 1793 permitted Catholics to secure degrees without any objectionable tests, but left them still excluded from the scholarships, fellowships, and other positions of emolument. It seemed, at first, as if a second college

in which Catholics might be permitted to hold or take degrees, or to be masters or fellows, was to be founded as a portion of the University of Dublin. Many people in Ireland wished that instead of founding a college merely for the education of the clergy in 1794 the government should found one for lay Catholic students and ecclesiastics, but this project was not carried out, and when, later on, the trustees of Maynooth College founded a lay department, steps were taken by the authorities to secure its suppression.

During the long struggle for Catholic emancipation, and for some system of education other than the openly proselytising institutions then favoured by the government, there was little time or inclination to consider the state of university education. The tithe agitation, and the struggle for Repeal diverted the attention of the Catholics from their less pressing grievances. Mr. Wyse and a few friends who were strong supporters of mixed education, did, indeed, make an effort in 1835 to secure an extension of the principles of the national schools to a system of provincial colleges, but his motion was resisted by the Whigs, and the proposed bill was rejected. For over nine years the question was, practically speaking, allowed to drop; but in July, 1844, Mr. Wyse again proposed that steps should be taken to provide for the higher education of Catholics by opening the honours and emoluments of Dublin University to Catholics and making Maynooth a theological faculty of the university, or by founding a purely Catholic University with rank, endowments and privileges equal to those enjoyed by Dublin University, or by some other plan likely to remove the grievances of which the Catholics justly complained. Sir Robert Peel promised,* if possible, to introduce some remedial legislation in the next session.

In fulfilment of this promise Sir James Graham introduced a bill to enable her Majesty to endow colleges for the advancement of learning in Ireland (9th May, 1845).

* *Hansard*, Vol. CXLII., pp. 1122-35.

He laid down the principle that "neither policy nor equity nor justice would admit any interference with Trinity College, as it was founded and as it existed, namely, that it was to be an entirely Protestant institution." * For the Catholics and Dissenters he proposed that three new non-residential colleges were to be founded, which were to be strictly undenominational in their character, but in which no attempt should be made to interfere with the religious beliefs of any of the students. The professors were to be chosen without reference to their religious beliefs, and were to be appointed and dismissed by the government. No central university was to be set up with which these colleges should be united, but Sir James Graham held out the hope that if the colleges proved successful a central university other than Dublin University should be established.

It should be remembered that at this period education in England and Scotland was strictly denominational, that Oxford and Cambridge were still exclusively Protestant, that Sir Robert Peel admitted such a system was not applicable to either England or Scotland, that Trinity College was still left entirely to Protestants, and that it was only for the Catholics of Ireland that a few "mixed" provincial colleges, admittedly inferior in standing to Dublin University, were deemed sufficient. At this period, too, the Catholics had begun to learn from their experience of the "mixed system" in the national schools, that no securities could be relied upon to exclude the dangers of proselytism where the whole power was vested in bodies hostile to both the religious and national aspirations of the majority of the people.

The bill was introduced into Parliament on the 9th May, 1845, and at a meeting of the Repeal Association, held in Dublin, O'Connell, adopting the epithet used by Sir Robert Inglis in the Parliamentary debate, denounced the proposed colleges as "godless." The vast body of the people approved of the attitude of O'Connell,

* *Hansard*, Vol. LXXX., p. 360.

but the Young Irelanders were opposed to a policy of unconditional opposition, at least, until the decision of the bishops should be known.* Dr. Crolly, the primate (14th May), convened a meeting of the bishops in Dublin. They met in the Presbytery, Marlborough Street, and on the proposition of Dr. MacHale, seconded by Dr. Slattery of Cashel, a resolution was passed unanimously condemning the proposed system as dangerous to the faith and morals of the Catholic people. They agreed, furthermore, that a memorial should be presented pointing out the amendments which should be made in order to make the measure acceptable. These amendments were; (1) that as the great body of the students likely to attend the colleges would be Catholics, a fair proportion of the professors and office-bearers should be Catholics whose moral conduct should be above suspicion, and that all office-bearers should be appointed by a board of trustees, of which the Catholic prelates of the provinces in which the colleges were to be erected should be members; (2) that for the Catholic students Catholic professors should be appointed in history, logic, metaphysics, moral philosophy, geology, and anatomy; (3) that if any professor or official of the new colleges should be convicted of attempting to undermine the faith or morals of any student he should be dismissed immediately; and (4) that as the proposed colleges were non-residential a salaried Catholic chaplain should be appointed on the recommendation of the bishop of the place to superintend the religious instruction of the Catholic students.†

At the opening of the debate on the second reading Sir James Graham announced (30th May) that the adoption of the most material facts in the bishops' memorial would be inconsistent with the principles of the bill. During the discussions, however, the government promised to take the utmost care in the selection of proper persons for the colleges in Munster and Con-

* Duffy, *My Life in Two Hemispheres*, Vol. I., pp. 109-13.
† Reilly, *Life of Dr. MacHale*, Vol. I., pp. 591-3.

naught, and professed their readiness to allow the erection of halls and a system of licensed lodging-houses, so as to provide for the religious care of the students; but in regard to the appointment of professors they insisted that the appointment and dismissal should be vested in the Crown till 1848 and afterwards, unless it should be provided otherwise by Parliament. The bill was passed in July, and a meeting of the bishops was summoned in September (20th) to consider what attitude they should adopt. Out of the twenty-six present, nineteen favoured the condemnation of the Queen's Colleges, and it was then agreed to refer the case to Rome for decision.* During the controversy on the measure Gregory XVI. died, and was succeeded by Pius IX. The nineteen prelates opposed to the Queen's Colleges presented their congratulations to the new Pope, and requested him to confirm the opinion of the majority of the Irish bishops. In September, 1846, Pius IX. sent his reply, in which he announced that the case was referred to Propaganda.

Meanwhile, the government appointed the presidents of the new colleges, Father Kirwan being appointed for Galway, and Sir Robert Kane for Cork. Drs. Cullen and Denvir were appointed on the Board of Visitors for Belfast, Drs. Slattery and Delaney on the Board for Cork, and Drs. MacHale and O'Donnell on that of Galway, but all declined to act till the decision of the Propaganda authorities should be announced. Sir Robert Peel resigned in June, 1846, and Lord John Russell, who had opposed the Queen's Colleges, succeeded. The question of the colleges was allowed to lapse, and it was only when Lord Clarendon became viceroy that any attempt was made to give effect to the scheme.

In October, 1847, a rescript was sent from Rome, confirming the decision of the majority of the bishops, and pronouncing the colleges to be dangerous to the faith of Catholics. The new statutes were prepared, and copies

* *Life of Dr. MacHale*, Vol. I., pp. 593-5.

sent to the bishops (19th April, 1848). Lord Clarendon wrote * to Dr. Murray, assuring him that in the councils, professorships, and other posts of the colleges "the Catholic religion would be fully and appropriately represented," but later developments showed that no reliance could be placed upon such assurances. An attempt was made to secure a revision of the condemnation, but in the end it was decided in Rome that the danger was intrinsic to the very system of the colleges, and could not be removed by any of the amendments that had been made or promised (11th Oct., 1848). The subsequent action of the government showed that Rome and the majority of the Irish bishops had good reason for their distrust of the English statesmen. Out of 20 professors appointed to Belfast 2 were Catholics, and of 20 in Cork 3 were Catholics, and out of 20 in Galway 2 were Catholics. A further decree was issued from Rome in 1850, forbidding ecclesiastics to take part in the administration of the colleges. At the synod of Thurles (1850) the question was considered once more by the bishops. The colleges were again condemned, and ecclesiastics were forbidden to have any official connection with them. Against the latter portion of the decision thirteen of the bishops appealed to Rome, but the decrees of the synod were confirmed, and the Catholic deans of residence appointed in Cork and Galway resigned their office. The government, however, persisted in the scheme, and in September, 1850, the Queen's University was incorporated in order to enable the students of the provincial colleges to secure their degrees.

Dr. MacHale and his friends who opposed the Queen's Colleges advocated the erection of a free Catholic University, and, as a result, in the rescript by which the Queen's Colleges were condemned (1847) the Irish bishops were urged to establish a university on the model of the Catholic University recently founded at Louvain. Similar instructions were sent from Rome in 1848. In itself the idea was excellent, and the obstacles, though

* *Life of Dr. MacHale*, Vol. II., pp. 133-5.

serious, were not insurmountable. But the time was badly chosen. The country was in the throes of the famine, while the failure of the political parties, Old Ireland and New Ireland, had driven the people almost to despair. The project, therefore, of founding a great national university at such a time was not likely to excite enthusiasm, and, besides, it was certain to meet the violent opposition of those who favoured the Queen's Colleges. Again, there was at that time no properly organised system of Catholic secondary schools from which students might be obtained sufficiently well-educated to avail themselves of the advantages of university education. Here and there a few colleges and seminaries had been erected, but not in sufficient numbers to meet the wants of the Catholic population. Hence, either the university should do what properly belonged to the secondary schools, and by so acting lower the character of university education, or else confine its efforts to the comparatively few who had an opportunity of reaching the proper matriculation standard. Had the Catholics of Ireland concentrated their attention first on the foundation of a proper system of secondary schools, and when this had been finished, upon a university to unify the whole system, a plan which was advocated by Dr. MacHale and Dr. O'Higgins in Rome in 1848, the results might have been very different.

At the synod of Thurles in 1850 it was agreed to follow the instructions from Rome regarding the foundation of a Catholic University, and in the pastoral letter issued from the synod the resolution of the bishops was made public. A committee, consisting at first of the four archbishops, and of one bishop from each of the provinces, was established. In 1851, this committee was enlarged by the inclusion of eight priests and eight laymen. Efforts were made to raise funds for the establishment of the university, in Ireland, the United States, Canada and Great Britain. The position of rector in the new university was offered to Dr. Newman in 1851. He came over to Ireland, and in conjunction with Dr. Leahy of

Cashel and Mr. Myles O'Reilly, drew up a report on the best method of establishing the university. The report was presented to the committee in November, 1851, and Dr. Newman was formally appointed rector (12th Nov.). He accepted the position thus offered to him, and the appointment was confirmed by the Holy See.

During the interval of three years which elapsed before the formal opening of the university, Dr. Newman visited Ireland, and delivered a series of lectures on university education in Dublin, 1852. The statutes for the university were drawn up and approved, funds were collected, buildings were secured in Stephen's Green, and arrangements made for the appointment of professors. On the Feast of St. Malachy (3rd Nov., 1854) the faculties of theology, philosophy and letters, and to some extent the faculty of science, began work. In 1855, the faculty of medicine was formally installed in Cecilia Street, and in 1856, the faculty of science was strengthened by the appointment of additional professors. In 1856, too, the university chapel was solemnly dedicated.

But from the beginning the institution was face to face with serious difficulties. The response to the appeal for funds, though exceedingly generous in the circumstances, fell far short of providing the money necessary for such a gigantic undertaking. The total funds received from September, 1850, till October, 1855, amounted to only £58,071, over £27,000 of which was subscribed in Ireland, £16,000 in the United States, and £4,000 in England and Scotland.* The total amount received from the issue of the appeal till 1859 was only £80,000.† From these sums several thousand pounds had to be deducted to cover the cost of collection; the purchase of the houses in Stephen's Green and in Cecilia Street, and the equipment of these establishments, necessitated a considerable outlay in the beginning; while the annual expenses of the university reached over £5,000. It was impossible, therefore, to create a strong reserve

* Newman, *My Campaign in Ireland*, p. 435.
† *Idem.*, p. 386.

fund, as the money was required almost as soon as it was collected, and thus, the university was practically dependent upon the fees of the students and the annual collections. The latter source of revenue was safe so long as the early enthusiasm remained, but as the hopes of securing a charter disappeared and as the number of students grew less, the annual collections began to decrease, and were finally suspended.

The university, too, was without a charter, and, consequently, the testimonials which it gave were without legal value. Naturally, students could not be attracted to such an institution, where the expenses were necessarily comparatively high, where there were few scholarships or endowments of great value to be won by competition, and where, too, they could not secure degrees similar to those which might be secured by attendance at the Queen's Colleges or Trinity College. The students of the medical faculty were in a better position, because the medical faculty having been recognised by the chartered medical bodies, the students of Cecilia Street could obtain their licenses by examination at the Royal College of Surgeons in Dublin or London. Hence, from the beginning the number of students attending the faculty of medicine steadily increased, while the number of those attending the faculties of arts and science began to go down.

Though Dr. Newman, the first rector of the university, spared no pains to make the undertaking a success, yet from the very nature of the case it could hardly be expected that he could devote his attention to the financial duties which his office obliged him to undertake. Instead of being able to concentrate all his energies on the literary and scientific organisation of the university, he was forced to spend his time in looking after the petty details of income and expenses, a work for which he had neither taste nor ability. Admirably suited, too, both from his Oxford experience and his recognised position in the literary world for the rectorship of an English Catholic educational establishment, he had very little

capacity for arousing the enthusiasm of the Irish people for a struggling national university. He made every effort to reconcile himself to his new surroundings, and to consult the wishes of the people who had summoned him to undertake such a responsible position, yet his heart was in England, and, as he put it himself, he "left England for a while for what he conceived to be a great English interest." * The appointment of Dr. Newman to the rectorship gave offence to many in Ireland, but when, later on, Dr. Newman recommended many of the English converts for appointment as professors and lecturers, national jealousy was aroused, and the suspicion began to gain ground that the Catholic University of Ireland was something of a misnomer. Nor was this suspicion lessened by Newman's own plan of founding a branch of the Oratory in Dublin, by his attempts to secure the appointment of another of the converts to the office of vice-rector, and by the efforts of some of the English bishops to secure Newman's elevation to the ranks of the episcopate while rector of the university. For his acceptance of the rectorship of the university, much against his own personal inclinations, and for the painstaking efforts which he made to secure its success, Irish Catholics should cherish a kindly feeling towards Dr. Newman. His appointment in the circumstances was not a happy one, but the blame for this rests on other shoulders, and even though his policy was not calculated to excite the enthusiasm of the Irish nation in favour of the struggling institution over which he ruled, it is hardly fair to attribute to Dr. Newman and his friends the entire failure of the university.

In addition to all these difficulties grave differences of opinion between the members of the committee and the bishops manifested themselves from the very beginning. The relative rights of the rector, of the committee, of the entire body of the episcopate, and of Dr. Cullen, the Papal delegate, were a source of endless embarrassment, and, as a result, at a time when success could have been

* *My Campaign in Ireland*, Adv. XLVII.

secured only by a united effort, those responsible for the foundation of the university were completely divided, and many of them, feeling that the university had passed out of their control, ceased to take any serious interest in its success. Dr. Newman's position was rendered still more difficult by these controversies, and his hopes of seeing the Catholic University in Dublin a great Catholic centre for England, Ireland and Scotland began to disappear. Hence, when the period of seven years, for which he had engaged to act as rector elapsed he resigned his position in Dublin, and retired to Edgbaston.

After an interval, during which it was hoped to induce him to change his decision, Dr. Woodlock was appointed rector of the university. The three faculties, of medicine, arts, and science, were completely organised, but very little was done for theology, and, owing to the difficulties in the way, hardly anything could be done for law. The *Atlantis*, a literary and scientific review, was begun in 1858, and the value of many of the contributions was soon recognised on all sides. In 1862, the foundation stone of the new buildings for the Catholic University was laid at Drumcondra in the presence of the bishops, the professors and students, the representatives of many of the corporations and of the trades' associations. The plans for the building were drawn by Mr. MacCarthy, professor of architecture, but owing to the want of funds the work was never continued. The number of students at that time in attendance at the university was 350.*

But the difficulties regarding a charter still remained, and so long as this remained there was comparatively little hope for the success of the university. In 1858, an application for a charter was made to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and this application was supported by the Irish Catholic members; but though Mr. Disraeli promised (May, 1859) a deputation of Irish members that he would bring their petition under the notice of the

* *Catholic University Calendar*, 1863, p. 22.

Cabinet, nothing was done. It was only in 1866, when Earl Russell was Prime Minister, that some steps were taken to enable the students of the Catholic University to secure degrees. The university was to be incorporated as a college without any direct state endowments, and by a supplemental charter the Queen's University, which hitherto could confer degrees only on students of the Queen's Colleges, was empowered to grant its degrees to all students who reached a satisfactory standard. The senate of the university was to be increased by the addition of a number of members favourable to the Catholic claims. The supplemental charter was given in June, 1866, but its acceptance was carried at a meeting of the senate only by the votes of the newly elected members. Three graduates of the Queen's University applied for an injunction, and the Master of the Rolls decided that the charter was illegal, and that the senate, therefore, could not exercise the powers which it purported to confer.

Owing to the great disturbances in Ireland in 1867 the government of Disraeli felt obliged to do something for Ireland, and as the Tories were opposed to disestablishment of the Church, they announced their intention of dealing with the university grievances of the Catholics. Lord Mayo, the Chief Secretary for Ireland, announced that they were resolved to establish a Catholic university "which, so far as circumstances would permit, should stand in the same position to Roman Catholics as Trinity College to Protestants." The question of direct endowment of such an institution was postponed, but a hope was held out that Parliament might be asked to provide a sufficient sum for the payment of the expenses of the examinations, for the foundation of university scholarships, for prizes, for the payment of the salaries of certain officers of the university, and, perhaps, for the erection of a hall and examination rooms.*

The bishops deputed two of their body to carry on negotiations with the government. These made certain

* *Dublin Review*, Third Series, Vol. XXIII.

suggestions to Lord Mayo, the principal of which was that, as the university was to be formally a Catholic university, the bishops on the senate should be allowed to veto the appointment of professors on religious and moral grounds, and that no professor should be continued in office after he had been judged by the bishops to have offended grievously against faith or morals. Lord Mayo refused to make such a concession, and while the bishops were in correspondence with the other Irish bishops, Lord Mayo publicly announced that the negotiations had broken down (29th May, 1868). It is clear that the entire affair was only a political dodge of the Tory party, who were anxious to secure support by showing their friendly attitude to Irish Catholics, and, at the same time, to win the support of English and Irish Protestants by throwing the blame for the failure upon the bishops.

The advent of the Liberal party to power, and the disestablishment of the Irish Church in 1869, led the Catholics to believe that their educational grievances were about to be remedied. The bishops, at their meeting in 1869, expressed their views as to the provision that should be made for Catholics in case the establishment of a national university were contemplated, while the Catholic laymen of Ireland presented a petition on the same subject to the Prime Minister Mr. Gladstone (1870).* In response to these demands, and as a continuation of his programme of religious equality, Mr. Gladstone introduced his university proposals in 1873. He proposed to suppress the Queen's University and the Queen's College in Galway, to separate Trinity College from Dublin University, and to place under Dublin University as constituent colleges, Trinity College, the Queen's Colleges in Cork and Belfast, Magee College, and the Catholic University. Any college which reached a certain educational standard might also be grouped under the new university. The divinity school

* Appendix to *First Report of Commission on University Education*, 1901, pp. 289-94.

was to be separated from Trinity College, which lost besides £12,000 a year, which sum was to be handed over to the Dublin University, but otherwise the college was untouched. The two Queen's Colleges were to continue in receipt of their endowments, and no direct financial assistance was to be given to the Catholic College in Dublin. Dublin University was also to be a teaching establishment, but no professorships were to be erected in philosophy or modern history.

A new senate, consisting of 28 members, was to be nominated by the Crown. These were to hold office for ten years, and all vacancies occurring in the meanwhile were to be filled alternately by the nomination of the Lord Lieutenant and that of the senate. In addition to the nominated members, representatives of the recognised colleges were to be added to the senate. The senate was to have at its disposal about £50,000. This sum was to be spent in providing for the expenses of examination, in paying the professors of the university, and in founding fellowships, scholarships, and prizes to be competed for by students of the different colleges.*

The plan was well received at first, but soon objections began to be raised on all sides. It was condemned by the senate of Trinity College, and was rejected by the bishops, on the grounds that it was only a continuation of "mixed education," that instead of redressing the Catholic grievances, it perpetuated them by upholding two of the Queen's Colleges, and by planting in the metropolis of Ireland two other great teaching institutions, the same in principle as the Queen's Colleges, that it left all the endowments to the Episcopalians, Presbyterians and secularists, and gave nothing to the Catholic College; while, at the same time, it obliged the unendowed Catholic college to compete for the university prizes and honours with richly endowed state institutions. They refused to allow their university to be affiliated to Dublin University unless the scheme were

* Walsh, p. 42. Butt, 74-96. *Morley's Life of Gladstone*, Vol. II., pp. 434-45.

largely modified, and they called upon the Parliamentary representatives to give the proposal their most energetic opposition. Mainly as a result of these resolutions the bill was thrown out on the second reading by a majority of three. The rejection of Mr. Gladstone's measure was followed by the Fawcett Act for the abolition of religious tests in Trinity College. This step was taken against the wishes of the Catholics of Ireland, and could not be regarded by them as a settlement of their educational grievances.

In 1876, a bill was introduced by Mr. Butt, but was opposed by the government, and in 1879 the O'Conor Don having introduced another plan for the settlement of the university question, the ministers announced their intention of submitting a new bill for the consideration of Parliament. According to this measure* Trinity College and the Queen's Colleges were to be left untouched. The Queen's University was abolished, and in its place was set up an examining body, known as the Royal University of Ireland, empowered to grant degrees to all students who presented themselves, provided they reached a certain standard. The senate was empowered to draw up a scheme of prizes, scholarships, and fellowships, for which Parliament should be asked to supply the necessary funds. The senate as eventually constituted consisted of an equal number of Catholics and Protestants, care being taken, however, in the selection of the Catholic members that the friends of "mixed education" should not be neglected. A scheme of 28 fellowships, valued at £400, was passed, 14 of these to be assigned to Catholics, one to Magee College, and the remainder to the Queen's Colleges. The 14 fellowships assigned to the Catholics were in the end concentrated in University College, Dublin, and thus, indirectly, some small endowment was provided for the university education of Catholics.

In order to meet the new situation that had been created, and to counterbalance the effect of the grouping

* 42 & 43 Vict., c. 65; First Report, 1901, pp. 231-35.

together of the three Queen's Colleges, the Catholic University was re-organised in 1882. Henceforth, it was to consist of University College, Dublin, Maynooth College, the School of Medicine, Cecilia Street, Blackrock College, Carlow and Clonliffe. In 1883, the management of University College was confided to the Society of Jesus. In 1891 the new constitution for the governing body of the Medical School was accepted. By means of the medical fellowships, examinerships, and fellowships in University College, some indirect financial assistance was given to this establishment.

The Royal University could not be accepted as a satisfactory settlement of the university grievances. The glaring inequality of treatment still remained, and, however much the Royal University may have done, it was at best only a temporary expedient hardly worthy of the name of a university. That the Catholics of Ireland had good reason for their complaints regarding higher education was admitted by all sections; but neither the Liberals nor the Tories showed any anxiety to introduce remedial legislation. In July, 1901, a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into the present condition of the higher, general and technical education available in Ireland outside Trinity College, and to report as to what reforms, if any, were desirable in order to render that education adequate to the needs of the Irish people.* The members of this commission presented their report in February, 1903. They suggested the reconstitution of the Royal University so as to include the three Queen's Colleges and a college for Catholics in Dublin. The report was received, but the Tory party refused to take any action. Another commission of inquiry was appointed by the Liberals in 1906. According to the report of this body it was impossible to recommend such changes in the constitution of Trinity College as would make it satisfactory to Catholics, while, on the other hand, the establishment of a Catholic University was not deemed advisable. Four of the commissioners

* Final Report, Sec. V.

favoured the idea of separating Dublin University from Trinity College, and of placing under Dublin University, Trinity College, a college for Catholics in Dublin, and the three Queen's Colleges. Another agreed with this plan in theory, but considered it impracticable; three others recommended the establishment of a college for Catholics under the Royal University, and one member thought that no change should be introduced. Finally, in 1908, the Irish Universities Act * was passed. According to the terms of this measure Trinity College was to be left untouched in regard both to its funds and its university *status*. The Royal University was to be suppressed. In its place were to be established two universities, one for Belfast, the nucleus of which would be the Queen's College, another in Dublin, under which were to be grouped a new college in Dublin and the Queen's Colleges in Cork and Galway. Besides these three constituent colleges, the university might recognise any other college not devoted to intermediate education, and might admit its students to the same privileges as those enjoyed by the matriculated students of the university.

No religious test was to be imposed on professors or students of the university or of the constituent colleges, nor was any part of the funds of the university to be employed for the purpose of erecting a faculty of theology, or of promoting the teaching of religion. Professorships of theology might be established by private enterprise, but even if a faculty of theology were established the members of the faculty could not be eligible for election to the board of studies of the university. Each professor was to sign a declaration to be framed by the commissioners so as to ensure the respectful treatment of the religious beliefs of the students.

Two bodies of commissioners were nominated to draw up statutes for the new universities. Besides these, governing bodies for the two universities and for the constituent colleges were appointed by the Crown. These

* 8 Edwd. VII., c. 38.

were to hold office for five years, and provision was made for the future constitution of these bodies. The funds of the Royal University, £20,000, were to be distributed between Belfast and the National University in Dublin, and, in addition, the new university in Belfast was to receive an annual grant of £18,000, the Dublin College £32,000, the Queen's Colleges in Cork and Galway £20,000 and £12,000 respectively. For the purposes of supplying buildings and equipments sums of money not exceeding £60,000 to Belfast, £150,000 to Dublin, £14,000 to Cork, and £6,000 to Galway were to be provided.

The net result of the new legislation is that, while Trinity College, with all its immense endowments, was left in the hands of the Protestants, and Belfast University was handed over practically to the Presbyterians, the Catholics of Ireland were expected to be content with a university consisting of three miserably endowed colleges scattered over three different provinces. While hardly any account was taken in the constitution of the governing body of Belfast University of the Catholics of Ulster, who formed about one half of the total population, yet both in the appointment of the commissioners and of the governing body of the National University, and in the restrictions imposed with regard to theological teaching, due respect was shown for the opinion of the small Protestant population in Leinster, Munster, and Connaught. The measure, representing as it does the best that the most liberal-minded statesmen of England were prepared to grant, should teach Irish Catholics once more what is the meaning attached to equality by English politicians of both parties. Still the Universities Act of 1908 marks a great step in advance. The new universities and colleges are not completely under the control of Dublin Castle. They will pass into the hands of Irishmen; the funds can be supplemented, according to the terms of the Act by local contributions; and it depends upon Irishmen themselves whether the universities are to be worthy of Ireland.

(*d*) The Education of the Clergy

Eighth Report of the Commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry (Maynooth), 1826. *Report of the Maynooth Commission*, 1853. Healy, *Maynooth College: Its Centenary History*, Dublin, 1895. Boyle, *The Irish College in Paris*, Dublin, 1901. MacDevitt, *Life of Father Hand, Founder of All Hallows College*, Dublin, 1885. Bellesheim, *Wilhelm Cordinal Allen und die Irischen Seminare auf dem Festlande*, Mayence, 1885. Dancoisne, *Histoire des Établissements religeux Britanniques fondés à Douai avant la Révolution Française*, Douai, 1880. O'Dea, *Maynooth and the University Question*, Dublin, 1903. *Maynooth College Calendar*, 1853-1908. *All Hallows Annual.*

For centuries the Irish theological schools had been suppressed, and it was necessary for the clerical students to seek their education outside Ireland. Partly owing to the generous donations made by Irish exiles abroad, partly owing to the assistance given by individuals and governments on the Continent, various establishments were opened in Spain, Italy, France, and the Low Countries for the education of students from Ireland. In Rome, besides St. Isidore's, the home of the Irish Franciscan Friars, and San Clemente, the residence of the Irish Dominicans, a seminary for Irish students was established by Urban VIII. in 1626, and formally opened in 1628. The new institution was at first confided to the Franciscans, but in 1635 it passed into the hands of members of the Society of Jesus. In 1772, it was taken from the Jesuits, and was confided to secular priests, but in 1798, owing to the French occupation of Rome, the college was closed for a time.

In Spain and Portugal Irish colleges had been established at Lisbon (1593), Salamanca (1593), Seville (1612), Madrid, Alcala, and Santiago. Those in Spain disappeared except Salamanca, and their funds were seized or united with those of Salamanca. In the Netherlands there were, besides the Franciscan College of St. Anthony and the Dominican College of Louvain, colleges for the education of secular priests at Louvain

and Antwerp. In France, Irish colleges were to be found at Paris, Bordeaux, Douay, Lille, Nantes, Toulouse and Poitiers. The principal of these were the Irish College at Paris consisting of the present college, and an Irish community in the old Lombard College. The college in Paris was established about 1578, and in 1676 the old Lombard College was acquired. About 1768 the present establishment in the *Rue du Cheval Vert,* now *Rue des Irlandais,* was secured. From that time till 1793 there were two establishments in Paris, the college for those who had been ordained priests in the Lombard College, and that for the junior clerics in the present Irish college.* The total number of students in these establishments varied very much at different times, but according to a return made by the trustees of Maynooth College in 1808 there were 478 students from Ireland preparing for the priesthood in the Irish colleges on the Continent immediately before the outbreak of the Revolution. Of these, 100 were in the Lombard College in Paris, 80 at the college in *Rue du Cheval Vert,* 80 at Nantes, 40 at Bordeaux, 30 at Douay, 10 at Toulouse, 8 at Lisle, 40 at Louvain, 30 at Antwerp, 32 at Salamanca, 16 at Rome, and 12 at Lisbon.†

The priests trained in these colleges for the mission in Ireland received an excellent education, and, as the history of the period shows, were in every way fitted for the difficult work that fell to their lot. As scholars, as gentlemen, and as clerics, they could challenge comparison with the clergy of any other nation, and, though their training made them, perhaps, a little too timid about taking part in public affairs, yet it is doubtful if in the circumstances of the period a bolder policy might not have involved more serious dangers. But on account of the damage done by the French Revolution, the supply of priests from these colleges could be expected no longer. The colleges were closed, the pro-

* Boyle, p. 54 *sqq.*
† *Maynooth Centenary History,* Appendix X.

perty in many cases seized, and the community of students and priests scattered. The Irish bishops were naturally anxious to secure some means of training their ecclesiastical students at home, while the English ministers, owing to their fear of a French invasion and of French influence upon the Irish clergy, were not unwilling to meet the wishes of the bishops. Dr. O'Keefe, bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, had already begun to found a college at Carlow. It was opened on the 20th October, 1793, when eight students presented themselves for matriculation. But owing to the state of the law it was feared that any attempt to establish such institutions on the scale necessary to meet the wants of the country would be sure to encounter strenuous opposition unless the consent of the government had been obtained. Besides, it was legally impossible to accumulate funds or to secure lands for the purposes of Catholic education.

Nearly all parties, English and Irish, were convinced that it was necessary to provide for the education of the Irish clergy. There were, however, differences of opinion about the best means of providing for such a work. Hely Hutchinson, Fitzgibbon, and the bigoted section in Ireland, wished that the college for the education of the Irish clergy should be placed under the control of Dublin University, while the bishops were anxious that separate colleges should be established and placed under their own control. Naturally, the Irish Catholic bishops had no wish that their clerical students should receive their preliminary education in the Diocesan Free Schools and their final training in Dublin University, even though it was conceded that their students "need not be obliged to attend the divinity professors." In a letter to the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda (5th Dec., 1793) the committee of the bishops pointed out the difficulties in connection with the erection of seminaries, namely, the poverty of the Catholic community, and the legal incapacity of their body to acquire lands or property for

the education of their students; but, at the same time, they declared their determination to have nothing to do with Dublin University.*

As a result of these deliberations and of the suggestions of the other bishops, they presented a memorial to the Lord Lieutenant in January, 1794. In this document they showed that the colleges on the Continent from which a supply of priests had been obtained hitherto, were closed, and that it was necessary to provide some means for the education of ecclesiastical students in Ireland. They pointed out, too, that for many reasons Dublin University could not be accepted by them as a fit place for such education; and they asked that a royal licence should be granted to them in order to secure the funds necessary for the erection and maintenance of colleges for the training of their clerical students. They asked for no endowments and no state assistance of any kind beyond legal protection for the funds required for such educational establishments. In January, 1795, they were informed that the request contained in their "memorial could not legally be complied with." †

It was pointed out to the bishops by their agent in London that the Duke of Portland, Earl Fitzwilliam, and Burke deemed it better to press for some scheme that would secure the education of both the Catholic clergy and laity, and hence the bishops changed their plans, and determined to petition for the establishment of a college for general Catholic education in each province. The object of the bishops in requesting the establishment of provincial colleges was clearly to checkmate the game of those who wished to place the education of both the clergy and laity under the control of Dublin University. That this was the plan of even a certain section of the Catholics is evident from the petition presented by Grattan in the name of some Catholics against the bill as proposed in 1795, and that the bishops were prudent

* *Maynooth Centenary History*, Appendix II.
† *Idem.*, Appendix I.

in trying to prevent Dublin University from controlling the education of their ecclesiastical students can hardly be disputed by anyone acquainted with the history of Irish education in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

In January, 1795, Earl Fitzwilliam arrived in Ireland as Lord Lieutenant. He was the friend of Catholic emancipation, and great hopes of important reforms were entertained by the Opposition and by the Catholics. The bishops presented a petition in favour of the establishment of a Catholic college or colleges, and the principal reason they put forward was the necessity of providing priests for the work in Ireland. Dr. Hussey had come over to Ireland to make arrangements for the establishment of a Catholic college, and the scheme seemed to be in a fair way towards a satisfactory settlement when the news arrived that Earl Fitzwilliam had been recalled (Feb., 1795). Dr. Hussey wrote to the Duke of Portland for instructions, and he was informed that he should remain in Ireland, as a bill for the establishment of a college for the education of the Catholic clergy would be introduced in the next session.* Lord Camden, the successor of Fitzwilliam, arrived in March, and though he was warned to oppose emancipation he was empowered to proceed with the scheme for the education of the Catholic clergy.

Edmund Burke was naturally indignant at the recall of Fitzwilliam, but, at the same time, he advised the Irish bishops to accept whatever was offered, provided that the conditions were not of too dangerous a character. He warned Dr. Hussey, however, to beware of entrusting the education of the Irish priesthood to their traditional enemies.

The bill that had been drafted by Earl Fitzwilliam was introduced and read for the first time on the 24th April, 1795. A petition against it was presented by Grattan from a section of the Catholics, on the ground that Protestants were to be excluded from the new college, and that the

* *Burke's Correspondence*, Vol. II., p. 284.

principles of separation and exclusion were to be revived and re-enacted. Grattan himself, however, supported the second reading, though, as might be expected, the Opposition had no sympathy with the measures proposed by the men who had supplanted Fitzwilliam. The measure passed quickly through the different stages, and on the 5th June, 1795, it received the royal assent.

In introducing the measure, Pelham, the Chief Secretary, made it clear that the education of the Catholic clergy was principally intended, yet the act itself, entitled "An Act for the better education of persons professing the Popish or Roman Catholic religion," was drafted in general terms. It simply repealed the law by which it had been made illegal to endow any college or seminary for Catholic education, and empowered a body of trustees named in the act to establish and maintain an academy solely for the education of persons professing the Catholic religion. It did not give the trustees corporate rights, but merely allowed them to receive donations and subscriptions, and to purchase and acquire lands not exceeding the annual value of £1,000. To the trustees was given the right of governing the college, appointing the officials, and making statutes, the latter subject, however, to the approval of the Lord Lieutenant. A sum of £8,000 (Irish) was entrusted to the trustees for the establishment of the academy.

The trustees named in the act were the four archbishops, seven bishops, Dr. Hussey, the first president of the college, six Catholic laymen, and four of the chief judges. These four were Protestants, and but rarely attended the meetings, leaving it almost entirely to the Catholic trustees to carry out the scheme. Meetings of the body were held immediately after the act had received the royal assent. Dr. Hussey was appointed president; the number of chairs were determined; and statutes for the government of the college prepared. The Duke of Leinster offered a site at Maynooth on very favourable terms, and in July, 1795, his offer was accepted. On the 1st October, 1795, the college was formally opened,

and five days later the lectures began. As it was impossible to procure the services of men trained in Irish colleges, most of the professors appointed to Maynooth were either Irishmen trained on the Continent, like Drs. Hussey, Power, Ferris, Aherne, or Frenchmen like Delahogue, Anglade, Delort, Darré, nearly all of whom were doctors of the Sorbonne. Forty students presented themselves for matriculation in 1795. The houses acquired by the trustees were unable to afford sufficient accommodation, and, hence, in the beginning some students could be accepted only as externs; but it was determined to undertake new buildings, and on the 20th April, 1796, in the presence of the Lord Lieutenant, the Lord Chancellor and other officials, the foundation stone of the new college was solemnly laid.

The bishops had been at first anxious for a college intended exclusively for the education of ecclesiastical students, but on the recommendation of their agent in London, Richard Burke, they changed their demand so as to cover the education both of the clergy and laity. The bill was drafted in general terms, though the intention of the government, as explained by the ministers, was that the college should be only for ecclesiastics. Still the trustees determined to take advantage of the terms of the act, and in 1796 arrangements were made for the erection of buildings to accommodate lay students.* A president was appointed for the lay college in 1798, but as he declined, the Rev. Patrick Coleman, a former student of the college, was appointed president, and the lay establishment was formally opened in 1800. Fitzgibbon, who was anxious to have Maynooth placed under the control of Dublin University, made a fierce onslaught on the college in 1799, one of his charges being that it had been intended both for the clergy and laity, but the government forced him to withdraw his opposition, and the annual grant which had been postponed was renewed.

In 1801, a visitation of the college was made by Lord

* *Centenary History*, p. 314.

Kilwarden, Lord Norbury, and Lord Avonmore. They noted the erection of the lay college, and notified to the government that such an establishment "seemed to be a departure from the original intention of the college at Maynooth," and the trustees were warned that no further steps should be taken towards establishing a lay boarding school as part of the college. Lord Fingall called upon the Earl of Hardwicke for further instructions, and he was informed that without insisting upon any sudden or immediate dissolution of the school, the government would prefer that the scheme should be dropped. The reason assigned for this course was that the existence of such an establishment might prevent Catholic lay students from entering Trinity College. Fitzgibbon, however, in a conversation with Dr. Troy, urged that the lay school should be retained until the question of its legality was finally determined.* Lord Hardwicke demanded a report from Lord Kilwarden on the intentions of the government in establishing the college at Maynooth. Lord Kilwarden assured him that the original intention was to educate only priests, and quoted in support of his view the speech of Mr. Pelham, the Chief Secretary, in introducing the measure. He held firmly by his view that for the sake of securing the attendance of Catholics at Trinity College, the lay school should be suppressed.† This view was also confirmed by the testimony of the Duke of Portland.‡ The government, therefore, commissioned Mr. Knox to inform the trustees that the lay college should be suppressed.§

In view of this communication the trustees were obliged to change their tactics. Instead of suppressing the lay college they handed over the lay school to four Catholic lay trustees. Henceforth it was a distinct establishment, having no official connection with

* *Cornwallis Correspondence*, Vol. III., p. 366.
† *Idem.*, Vol. III., p. 370.
‡ *Memoirs of Viscount Castlereagh*, Vol. II., p. 385.
§ *Eighth Report of the Commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry*, 1826, Appendix, pp. 444-5.

Maynooth, and receiving no part of the state endowments. Most of the better class students who had attended it previously were withdrawn, and the establishment of Clongowes and similar institutions for secondary education rendered the existence of such a lay college less necessary. The house and lands were sold to the trustees of the ecclesiastical college in 1817, and the lay school was definitely closed. From these facts it is evident that Sir Robert Peel was right when he declared in the House of Commons (1845) that the government was responsible for the closing of the lay department at Maynooth.*

In 1800, Lord Dunboyne died, leaving by his will his Meath property to the trustees of Maynooth College. He himself had been appointed bishop of Cork in 1763, but on his succession to the Dunboyne title in 1786 he petitioned Pius VI. for permission to marry. This petition was rejected, and the bishop promptly left the Catholic Church. Before his death, however, he repented, and at the request of Dr. Troy, with whom he communicated, Father Gahan, an Augustinian, visited him and gave him the benefit of his spiritual ministrations. The will was contested on the grounds that Lord Dunboyne, having been a relapsed Papist, was not capable of transmitting property by will, and at the suggestion of the judge a compromise was agreed to, according to which the property was divided between the trustees and the heirs-at-law. Maynooth received an estate worth about £500 a year. This sum, together with an annual grant of about £700 given by the government, was applied to the erection of an establishment for the higher education of the more promising students who had already finished with distinction their ordinary college course. A beginning was made in 1813, but it was only after 1820 that the arrangements and statutes for the Dunboyne establishment were fully drafted.

On the occasion of the annual grants to Maynooth

* *Hansard*, April, 1845, p. 1002.

charges of all kinds were levelled against the college and its administration. It was said that its students were sprung from the lower classes in Ireland, that it was a centre of sedition, that its education was indifferent, and its discipline dangerous. Hence, the commission appointed in 1824 to examine into the state of education in Ireland determined to investigate the working of Maynooth College. The examination lasted for nearly two months, and except that the report contained a clear refutation of the charges made against the institution, it was in nearly every other respect worthless. The commissioners seemed to have been more anxious to display their own controversial skill than to give any serious attention to educational problems.

The annual grant amounted usually to between £8,000 and £9,000. This was found to be insufficient to provide for the education of a sufficient number of priests to meet the wants of the Irish mission. The average attendance at Maynooth between 1830 and 1840 was about 400. Hence, in 1841 the trustees petitioned for an increase of the annual grant. Nothing was done till 1845, when Sir Robert Peel introduced a bill by which the trustees were recognised for the first time as a legal corporation; they were permitted to acquire lands not exceeding the annual value of £3,000; and the annual grant was increased to £26,000. The regulation for the expenditure of this money was carefully laid down in the act, and in this way the utility of the increased grant was greatly diminished. A sum of £30,000 was also provided for the purpose of erecting new buildings.

Owing to the additional grant the number of students rapidly increased, and new professorships were established. The attacks of a bigoted section in England and Ireland upon the college continued, and in 1853 another Royal Commission investigated the character of the teaching and administration of Maynooth. It found, however, no grounds for the charges that had been levelled against the institution. In 1869, the Irish

Church was disestablished, and at the same time Maynooth College was cut adrift from the state. The *ex-officio* trustees were abolished, and a sum of £309,040 was granted to Maynooth in place of the annual grant which was discontinued. A debt of £12,704 that had been due to the Board of Works was remitted.

Maynooth was at last free from state control. The administration of the college was vested in the Irish bishops, and new arrangements were made to suit the changed circumstances. In 1876, Maynooth was declared a college of the Catholic University, and an elaborate scheme arranging the relations of the two institutions was drawn up, but no attempt was made to give effect to the resolution. After the erection of the Royal University some steps were taken to secure that students in the arts department of Maynooth should present themselves for the examinations. The policy was, however, changed, and it was only in 1904 that the Maynooth students began to attend these examinations in great numbers. According to the regulations in force in the college for some years no student may begin the study of theology till he has secured the degree of B.A. at the university.

In 1885, the Propaganda made many valuable suggestions about the government and administration of Maynooth. Most of these were adopted by the trustees. In 1891, the college chapel was solemnly consecrated, and in 1895, the centenary of the college was celebrated with great solemnity. Since that time the college has developed rapidly. The charter for granting degrees in theology, canon law, and philosophy, was conceded by the Holy See in 1896-99; the four faculties of theology, canon law, philosophy, and arts were duly organised; the number of chairs, especially in the arts department, was greatly increased; the students of the college were obliged to present themselves for the examinations of the Royal University, and a number of distinguished fellows of the Royal University were introduced as lecturers. In the University Act of 1908, however, the claims of

Maynooth were practically ignored, except that Maynooth, like any other college reaching a certain standard, may apply for recognition to one or other of the universities. The college is legally vested in the trustees, all of whom are now members of the Irish episcopate, while the administration belongs to the whole body of bishops. The total number of superiors, professors and lecturers employed at present is about 40, and the average number of students in residence about 570.

The great missionary college of All Hallows, Dublin, owes its origin to Father Hand, who left Maynooth in order to take up his residence with the recently-formed community of the Fathers of the Congregation of the Mission at Castleknock. The young priest, anxious to provide for the spiritual wants of the Irish who were obliged to emigrate, determined to erect a seminary for the education of priests who might undertake such a mission. With the sanction of Gregory XVI., and the assistance of O'Connell, he opened the College of All Hallows in 1842. By his exertions he succeeded in gathering around him a staff of able professors, who adopted to a large extent the rules of the Sulpician communities. In 1846, Father Hand died, but the preliminary difficulties had been to a great extent overcome, and the College of All Hallows continued to flourish and to send its students to nearly all parts of the world. The Catholic Church in the United States, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa is deeply indebted to All Hallows for the supplies of young well-trained priests which it has continued to send to those countries since its foundation. The number of priests ordained each year is about 25. Since 1892 the college has been placed in the hands of the Vincentian Fathers, who are assisted by some of the professors of the original community, some secular priests and some laymen.

In 1826, the Irish College in Rome was re-established, new statutes were prepared for it by Leo XII., and some arrangements made to repair the loss of the funds that

had been seized during the period of revolution. In 1836, Gregory XVI. arranged that the Irish students should take possession of the Church of St. Agatha and the adjoining building where the college is situated till the present day. The Irish colleges in France disappeared except the Irish College in Paris. By a decree of the First Consul all the Irish colleges were amalgamated, and, in addition, the Irish, English and Scotch students were to form one community in the Irish College. This union existed from 1804 till 1814, when the English and Scotch students were permitted to return to their own colleges. Attempts were made to secure some compensation for the property, valued at 2,416,210 francs, which had been seized or destroyed during the war. In 1818, France paid over to England a sum producing an annual revenue of 3,000,000 francs, in order to meet all claims for losses to British subjects during the wars. But when the authorities of the Irish College applied for portion of this compensation it was decided by the English Commissioners that their claims could not be sustained. An appeal was made to the Privy Council in 1832, but with no better result. The French seized the Irish colleges because they were the property of English subjects, and England, having secured indemnity, refused to make good the losses of the Irish Colleges on the ground that they were French. An attempt was made to re-open this question during the years 1871-5, but the government refused the motion for inquiry. In 1858, the college was handed over to the Irish Vincentians, under whose rule it has since continued to prosper and develop.

The Irish colleges in Spain disappeared, or were united with the college at Salamanca, which is still under a rector appointed by the Irish bishops and frequented by ecclesiastical students from Ireland. The students are lodged in the college, and receive their education at the seminary conducted by the members of the Society of Jesus. The Irish colleges in the Netherlands were overthrown during the wars of the Revolution. In 1833, Dr. O'Higgins, Bishop of Ardagh, was commis-

sioned to proceed to Belgium to negotiate with the government for the restoration of the property that had been seized. After a careful examination it was found impossible to attempt the erection of an Irish college in Louvain, but the government agreed that the remaining burses should be applied in accordance with the wishes of the testators. The income derived from these foundations was placed at the disposal of the bishops for the education of ecclesiastical students at Maynooth or in Rome.

Besides Maynooth, Carlow, the Irish Colleges in Rome, Paris and Salamanca, students are permitted to finish their theological studies in Clonliffe College, Dublin, and at the colleges in Thurles, Waterford, Kilkenny, and Wexford. Carlow, Thurles, and Waterford assist All Hallows in supplying priests for the foreign missions. In most of the dioceses in Ireland preparatory seminaries have been established. These serve both as seminaries and as institutions for general secondary education.

CHAPTER IV

THE CHURCH IN AMERICA

The United States

(*a*) The Colonial and Early Federal Period (1605-1629)

Hughes, *The History of the Society of Jesus in North America, Colonial and Federal*, 1580-1645, Vol. I. (Text), London, 1907; Vol. I. (Documents, 1605-1838), 1908. Shea, *The Catholic Church in Colonial Days*, New York, 1886. Campbell, *Pioneer Priests of North America*, New York, 1908. Shea, *History of the Catholic Missions among the Indian Tribes of the United States*, New York, 1860. Shea, *Discovery of the Mississippi Valley*, New York, 1852. Spalding, *Sketches of Early Catholic Missions in Kentucky*, Louisville, 1870. *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society*, Vols. I.-X., Philadelphia, 1884-96. *Catholic Historical Studies*, Vols. I.-XIII., Philadelphia, 1884-1899. Shea, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, 4 vols., New York, 1886-92. Murray, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, New York, 1876. Clarke, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States from the Earliest Period, with Biographical Sketches of the Living Bishops*, 2 vols., Philadelphia, 1885. *History of the Catholic Church in New England*, 2 vols., Boston, 1899. Baylay, *A Brief Sketch of the Early History of the Catholic Church*, Baltimore, 1874. Shea, *Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll*, 2 vols., New York, 1880. Campbell, *Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll*, Baltimore, 1860. Desgeorges, *Vie de Mgr. Flaget, Évêque de Bardstown*, Paris, 1865. *The Life and Travels of Father de Smedt, S.J.*, 1801-1873, New York, 1905. Cobb, *The Rise of Religious Liberty in America*, London, 1902. Claudio Jannet, *Les États Unis Contemporains*, 2 vols., Paris, 1889.

The Spaniards were the first to found Catholic missions in the territory now known as the United States. They began their missionary work in the early portion of the sixteenth century, and their efforts were confined principally to the south and south-western districts, namely,

to the present States of Florida, New Mexico, Texas, and California.* From Canada, where permanent French colonies were established during the reign of Henry IV., missionaries were despatched into the territories now represented by Maine and New York, and the region lying westward along the valley of the Mississippi. It was in these regions that two of the greatest glories of the early American church, Fathers Jogues and Marquette, spent their lives.

English colonies began to be formed in the beginning of the seventeenth century, the earliest being Virginia (1607), New England (1620), Maryland (1634), and Pennsylvania (1684). Of these, Maryland alone was a Catholic colony. It was founded by Lord Baltimore, who was driven to adopt this plan of founding a Catholic colony principally owing to the penal laws enforced against Catholics in Great Britain and Ireland. To his credit be it said Maryland, though almost entirely Catholic in its population, set a striking example of religious and civil liberty. There, no man was to be persecuted on account of his faith, and in Catholic Maryland the Puritan Dissenter was freer from persecution than he was likely to be in Protestant Virginia.

But the Civil War in England between Charles I. and the Parliament found an echo in the English colonies of America. Maryland naturally took the side of the king, while the Puritans backed the party of the Parliament. The Catholics were defeated; the religious liberty which they had guaranteed to others was denied them (1654); and an era of persecution, similar to that in England and Ireland under Cromwell, began. On the restoration of Charles II. (1660), Lord Baltimore regained his position in Maryland, and once more freedom of worship was guaranteed. During the reign of Charles II. a great effort was made to strengthen the English colonies against French invasion, and to develop English power in the new country. The Duke of York, afterwards

* Soto-Citry, *Histoire de la conquéte de la Floride*, Paris, 1865. Dufouri, *The Martyrs of New Mexico*, 1880.

James II., took a great share in this work of consolidation, and, as he himself was a Catholic, greater liberty was allowed the Catholics in the other colonies. Some settled in New York, and, later on, a few in Pennsylvania. On the accession of William III. the Protestants rose against the Stuart governors, overthrew their power, and another season of bitter persecution opened for the Catholics in the English-American colonies. In all the states the penal code against Catholics was enforced during the eighteenth century with the same severity as in England.

The persecution ceased, however, with the War of American Independence (1774-1783). The necessity for securing the assistance of all colonists in the war against England, and the alliance with Catholic France, made it politic to proclaim a policy of toleration. The Congress of 1774 urged the necessity of forgetting religious animosity, and in Maryland and the other colonies the persecution ceased. The Catholics of Maryland rallied to the support of their brother colonists. Amongst the men who appended their names to the Declaration of Independence (1776) no man risked more than Charles Carroll, while the names of Daniel Carroll, Maryland, and Thomas Fitzsimmons, Pennsylvania, deserve to be remembered for their share in drawing up the Constitution in the Congress of 1789. The former intolerance of the colonies had aroused the prejudices of Canadian Catholics, and, hence, during the war, although France was on the side of Congress, and although every effort was made to secure the adhesion of Canada, Canada held itself completely aloof from the struggle. Nor is this attitude to be wondered at, considering that Congress in 1774 in an address to the people of Great Britain complained bitterly of the Quebec Act, by which the Canadian Catholics secured their religious liberty.

In 1787, the constitution of the thirteen confederate states was adopted by Congress. In this constitution it is expressly laid down (VI. 3) "that no religious test

shall ever be required as a qualification for any office or public trust under the United States"; and in one of the amending clauses passed in 1789 it was provided that Congress should make no law respecting the establishment of a religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. It is clear, then, that neither religious liberty nor equality was explicitly guaranteed by the constitution of the United States, since each of the particular states was free to do as it wished, to endow one religion or prohibit another. The want of such a guarantee was one of the objections brought against the constitution in the Congress of 1789.

In most of the states, however, religious liberty was gradually introduced, and the endowment of any particular form of Christianity abandoned. Virginia and Maryland led the way in the introduction of the voluntary system. But it was only in 1818 that Congregationalism was disestablished in Connecticut, in 1833 in Massachusetts, and in 1844 in New Hampshire. In New York, North Carolina, and New Jersey restrictions were also maintained against the Catholics,* but under the spirit of the constitution such restrictions were gradually abolished, and at present no state would be admitted into the confederation unless it is prepared to recognise religious equality.†

From the foundation of the Catholic colony in Maryland, the American Catholic colonists were supposed to be under the jurisdiction of one of the English vicars apostolic. Since the political independence of the colonies had been secured it was felt incongruous that the Catholics of the new republic should be subject to an English vicar, and hence it became necessary in the changed circumstances of the time to adopt a new organisation for the Catholics of the United States. The number of Catholics, according to the report of Father Carroll to the Propaganda in 1785, was 15,000 in Maryland, about half that number in Pennsylvania, and about

* Shea, *History of the Church*, pp. 45-6.
† Jannet, Vol. II., pp. 1-12.

1,500 scattered through the other states. This does not include the French Canadian Catholics in Ohio and the Mississippi regions, who were still under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Quebec.

The Maryland mission had been for the most part in the hands of the Jesuit Fathers. There were then about nineteen priests engaged on this mission, under Father Lewis, the vicar general of the vicar apostolic of the London district. Meetings of the clergy were summoned twice, in 1783, and in October, 1784, to lay down rules for their body, and to take steps for establishing a permanent organisation. It was at the last meeting in 1784 that the famous resolutions against the appointment of a bishop were proposed and carried. The conference agreed; (1), that a bishop is at present unnecessary; (2), that if one is sent it is decided by the majority of the chapter that he shall not be entitled to any support from the present estates of the clergy; and (3), that a committee of three be appointed to prepare and give an answer to Rome conformable to these resolutions. In June, 1784, Father John Carroll was appointed superior of the American missions, with power to bless the oils, give confirmation, and administer the mission till such times as Rome could make arrangements for the appointment of a bishop.

The Maryland missionaries were evidently afraid that the appointment of a bishop would evoke an outburst of bigotry, and perhaps lead to another era of penal laws. But the Holy See, through its nuncio at Paris, learned from Benjamin Franklin, the American ambassador, that the federal government had no desire to mix itself up in religious questions. In 1785, Carroll was appointed prefect apostolic, but in his letter accepting the office he urged the advisability of permitting the priests to have a voice in the election of their superior. At last, in 1788, when the difficulties about the administration of the Church property opened the eyes of the clergy to the advantage of having a canonically-appointed bishop, and when the danger of objections on the score of foreign

interference had in part disappeared, the clergy petitioned the Pope for the appointment of bishop. Rome acceded to their request, and permitted them to select their own candidate. In May, 1789, the election was held. Twenty-five priests were present, and, with one dissentient, all voted for Father Carroll. He was, accordingly appointed by the Pope, and started for England, where he was consecrated (15th Aug., 1790) in the chapel of Lulworth Castle, the residence of Mr. Weld, by the senior vicar apostolic of England. The first bishop of the United States took up his residence at Baltimore, which was fixed on as his see.

John Carroll, the first bishop of the United States, was born in 1735 at Upper Marlboro', where his father, a native of Ireland, carried on a flourishing business as a merchant. The boy was educated first at a Jesuit grammar school in Maryland, and afterwards in the College of St. Omers. He joined the Society of Jesus in 1750. He studied theology at Liège, was ordained a priest in 1769, taught for a few years at St. Omers and Liège, and came to England in 1773 as chaplain to Lord Arundel of Wardour. It was while there he learned of the bull of Clement XIV., dissolving the Society of Jesus (16th Aug., 1773). He returned to Maryland, where he took up his residence with his mother, and attended to the spiritual wants of the Catholics in that district.

On the outbreak of the War of Independence he was requested to accompany a deputation sent to Canada to seek the aid, or, at least, the neutrality, of Canada. But owing to the display of intolerant bigotry that had been made so recently by Congress the deputation was badly received, and failed to make any impression.* He returned to his mother's residence, where he continued his ministrations, but it appears that the relations between himself and Father Lewis, the former superior of the Jesuits, and the then head of the Maryland mission, were not harmonious. In the difficult negotiations with Rome that finally led to the establishment of the see of

* Shea, *History of the Church*, pp. 44-6.

Baltimore Father Carroll took a leading part, and was recognised by the priests as their natural superior, a fact which is proved by their almost unanimous selection of him as their bishop in 1789.

In 1786, as prefect apostolic, he took up residence at Baltimore, and threw himself into the public life of the city. He urged strongly on Congress the necessity for guaranteeing religious liberty in the United States, and it is, no doubt, due in part to his exertions that the above-mentioned clauses were adopted into the constitution. On the election of Washington as President of the States, in 1790 Bishop Carroll, in the name of the Catholic clergy, and four lay representatives, Charles Carroll (Carrollton), Daniel Carroll (Maryland), Dominick Lynch (New York), and Thomas Fitzsimmons (Pennsylvania), presented him with an address of congratulation, to which Washington, in the course of a very friendly reply, declared that he hoped the American nation would never forget the patriotic part played by the Catholics in the revolution and in the establishment of the government, or the friendly assistance which it had received during the struggle from a friendly Catholic nation.

The first care of the new bishop was to establish a seminary which might supply priests for the scattered and growing Catholic population. In this project, as well as in his other educational and charitable schemes, the French Revolution and the persecution of the clergy and religious in France, afforded him enormous assistance by forcing many earnest workers to seek a home in America. The superior of the Sulpicians in Paris, M. Émery,* was as anxious to find a home for his brethren in America as the bishop was for the establishment of a seminary, and, hence, after a very brief interchange of views, three or four of the community of St. Sulpice accompanied by a few seminarists arrived in Baltimore, and opened the seminary of St. Mary's, Baltimore

* *Vie de M. Émery*, 2 vols., Paris, 1861-1862.

(1791).* Nor was the foundation of the seminary the only good work for which the infant Church of America is indebted to the French Revolution. Many of the exiled priests fled thither from France, and enabled Bishop Carroll to supply priests to districts that had been neglected, while the French Sisters, who also sought a home, enabled the bishop to establish the educational and charitable institutions for which his episcopate is so remarkable.

In 1788, Bishop Carroll had begun the erection of Georgetown College. The funds required for its erection and maintenance were supplied from Jesuit resources, and it remained in a great measure under the control of the Fathers of the Society. At first, however, on account of their limited numbers, and their peculiar position owing to the suppression of the society by Clement XIV., it was necessary for them to avail themselves of the help of Sulpicians and others, but from the restoration of the society by Pius VII. (1814), Georgetown has remained in the hands of the Jesuits. The proximity of the college to the Federal Capital gave it a decided advantage, and since 1815, when it secured a university charter, Georgetown has done good work for lay Catholic education in America.†

But besides the seminary and Georgetown College the bishop felt it necessary to establish many other educational and charitable institutions. Here again the French exiles rendered invaluable service. In 1790, four Carmelite Sisters arrived in America from Antwerp on the invitation of the bishop, and took up their residence in Maryland. Two years later some of the Poor Clares, driven from France, fled to America, and took up their residence in Georgetown. The American branch of the Sisters of the Visitation owes its origin to Miss Alice Lalor, a native of Queen's County, Ireland, who emigrated with her parents to America in 1797. She wished to return to Ireland to become a nun, but Father Neale,

* *Memorial Volume of the Centenary of St. Mary's, Baltimore*, Baltimore, 1891.

† *History of Georgetown College*, Washington, 1876.

her spiritual director, urged her to remain and found a religious community in America. She at first took up her residence as a teacher with the Poor Clares, but after some time together with a few associates, she opened a school in Georgetown, and Father Neale, having now become coadjutor to Bishop Carroll, advised the little community to adopt the rules drawn up for the Visitation Sisters by St. Francis de Sales. In 1808, they were installed in the house that had been abandoned by the Poor Clares, and in 1812, Miss Lalor was formally appointed superioress of the "Pious Ladies," or Visitation Nuns of America. The congregation spread rapidly, and soon had branches at Baltimore, St. Louis, Washington, and Brooklyn. The Sisters of Charity were founded in America by Mrs. Seton,* an American lady, who, having undertaken a journey to the Continent with her husband, where he died, became a Catholic in 1805. At first she opened a school in New York, and in 1808, removed to Baltimore. She wished to establish a religious community, and her wishes having been approved by Bishop Carroll, a plot of ground was secured at Emmitsburg, and Mrs. Seton and her associates were formally installed there in 1809. The little community adopted the rules drawn up by St. Vincent de Paul for the Sisters of Charity. The order spread with wonderful rapidity, and rendered great service to Catholicity in the schools, hospitals, and orphanages of America.

In 1791, Bishop Carroll convoked a synod of his clergy, at which twenty-two priests assembled.† Several useful regulations were adopted, and owing to the increased Catholic population in the states it was decided to petition the Holy See to appoint a coadjutor. Pius VI. gladly acceded to this request, and in 1800, Father Neale, another Jesuit, was consecrated bishop, and took up his duties as coadjutor. It is noteworthy, too, that so early as the year 1790, a splendid Catholic edition of the

* Sadleir, *Elizabeth Seton*, New York, 1905.
† *Collectio Lacensis*, Vol. III., pp. 1-7.

Bible was issued from the printing press of Carey, Stewart & Co. Owing to the circumstances of the country, and the fact that Bishop Carroll was obliged to accept the assistance of any clergyman who volunteered his services, difficulties soon sprang up that might have proved very serious for the little Catholic community were it not for the decision which the bishop obtained from the civil courts that the Catholic bishop of Baltimore had the sole episcopal authority over the Catholic Church in the United States, that every Catholic congregation within that region was subject to his inspection, and that no Catholic priest could exercise any jurisdiction over any congregation in the United States without the authority of the bishop. In 1806, Bishop Carroll laid the foundation stone of his cathedral at Baltimore.

Owing principally to immigration from Europe, the number of Catholics in the United States rapidly increased, as did also the number of clergy. Encouraged by such wonderful progress, and feeling that it was impossible for one bishop to superintend the affairs of such a large and scattered community, Bishop Carroll petitioned the Holy See to establish more bishoprics in the United States. Pius VII. acceded to this request in 1808. He raised Baltimore to the position of a metropolitan see, and under it he placed four suffragan dioceses, namely, New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Bardstown. Bishop Cheverus was named for Boston, Flaget for Bardstown, Egan for Philadelphia, and Concanen for New York. Louisiana, with a large Catholic population, had also been added to the United States by an arrangement with France in 1803, and was admitted as a state of the Union in 1812. Thus, before his death, in 1815, Bishop Carroll had the happiness of seeing the Catholic Church in the United States well organised, with its hierarchy, its clergy, religious orders, colleges, schools, and charitable institutions.

Archbishop Neale succeeded to the metropolitan see of Baltimore, but, as he was old and infirm, he applied

for an assistant, and in 1817, Abbé Maréchal was appointed coadjutor. The new bishop threw himself into the work of completing and extending the organisation. A college was founded at Pennsylvania in 1806, Mount St. Mary's, Emmitsburg, was founded by Abbé Dubois in 1809, numerous schools were opened by the Sisters in the different Catholic centres, while the great Sulpician seminary in Canada generously offered its services to train ecclesiastical students for the American mission. The French contributed largely to supply funds for the poorer districts in the United States. As a result of an organisation started in Lyons in 1816 to raise funds for the diocese of New Orleans, the Association for the Propagation of the Catholic Faith was established there in 1822, and contributed large amounts to different dioceses in America.* Similar associations on the Continent also rendered generous service.

The population of the States increased rapidly owing to immigration from the Continent, Great Britain and Ireland; and the number of states of the Union had increased from thirteen to twenty-four (1820). With the increased population the necessity for establishing new dioceses became pressing. From 1815 till 1822 frequent petitions were sent to Rome for the erection of dioceses, all of which were speedily granted; so that in 1822, the United States were divided into nine dioceses, namely, Baltimore, comprising Maryland and the district of Colombia; Boston, comprising the New England States; New York, comprising the State of New York and half of New Jersey; Philadelphia, comprising Pennsylvania, Delaware, and half of New Jersey; Bardstown, comprising Kentucky and Tennesse; Charleston, comprising the two Carolinas and Georgia; Richmond, comprising the State of Virginia; Cincinnati, comprising Ohio, Michigan, and the North-West territory; and New Orleans, comprising Louisiana, Mississippi, and Missouri.† Bishop Whitfield

* *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi*, Vol. I.
† O'Shea, *History of the Church in the United States*, pp. 109-10.

succeeded to the metropolitan see of Baltimore in 1828, and the following year (1829) the first provincial council of Baltimore was held. The main subjects to be dealt with by the council were Lay Trusteeship, the administration of the Sacraments, and the establishment of a society for the diffusion of Catholic literature. The bishops also favoured the founding of Catholic journals, and in the principal cities Catholic weekly journals were established. According to the calculations of the fathers of the council the total Catholic population of the United States at this period was over five hundred thousand.*

(*b*) Obstacles to the Progress of Catholicity

O'Shea, *The Two Kenricks,* Philadelphia, 1904. Hassard, *Life of the Most Rev. John Hughes*, New York, 1866. *Works of Dr. Hughes*, 2 vols., New York, 1864. Courcy, *The Catholic Church in the United States*, 1856. Griffin, *History of Bishop Egan*, Philadelphia, 1903. André, *Le Catholicisme aux États Unis*, 2 vols., Paris, 1905. De Meaux, *L'Église Catholique, et la Liberté aux États Unis*, Paris, 1893. Klein, *La Séparation aux États Unis*, Paris, 1908. *Works of the Rt. Rev. John England*, 5 vols., 1849.

But the Church in the United States was not without its difficulties, both internal and external. The greatest danger threatened its organisation from the authority which the parochial trustees claimed for themselves not alone over the administration of ecclesiastical property, the churches, schools, and cemeteries, but also over the appointment and dismissal of the officiating clergymen. Many causes were at work to produce serious complications in this respect. The Catholics were but a small minority in the States. Everywhere they looked they saw the different Protestant sects organised, practically speaking, on the basis of lay control, their ecclesiastical property owned and administered by a lay committee, from whom the clergymen received their appointment, and to whose control they were subject. Besides, the laws governing the rights

* *Collectio Lacensis*, Vol. III. pp. 10-35.

of associations to hold property were framed from the Protestant standpoint. The law recognised the right of the parish or the congregation to hold property, but it insisted that the trustees should be elected by all the parishioners or members of the particular congregation. Bishop Carroll accepted this system of trustee ownership in the beginning, and other bishops followed his example.

For other reasons, too, Lay Trusteeship naturally crept into the Church in the United States. Several of the Catholics were from the Continental countries, where the Church property was committed to the care of the *Fabriques*, or committee of control. Accustomed to such a method of administration at home, the Catholic immigrants from the Continent did not see why it should not be introduced into America, forgetting that in the Continental countries the civil law generally recognised the peculiar constitution of the Catholic organisation, while in America it was not yet clear how the different states would deal with legal conflicts between the bishop and the trustees. Again, in many places where a small community of Catholics existed, there was, at first, no priest in residence. The little community very often built some kind of a rude church and presbytery, and then sought for some priest who would be willing to undertake the care of the mission. Though the great body of the American clergy were men of irreproachable lives and untiring zeal, yet it is only natural that drawn as they were from nearly every nation in Europe, and sometimes educated at centres where Catholic principles received a very liberal interpretation, some should be found to avail themselves of lay control in order to escape the chastening influence of episcopal jurisdiction.

Even in the days of Archbishop Carroll the system of Lay Trusteeship had led to serious abuses. The quarrels between the Catholics were carried from the ecclesiastical to the civil courts, where the archbishop was obliged to appear and defend his right to rule the

Catholic community, to enforce his decisions, and to appoint and dismiss the officiating priests. Fortunately, according to the decision of Judge Addison in the Court of Common Pleas, Pennsylvania, the right of the bishop to supreme control of each congregation and of each priest officiating in the United States was clearly recognised (1798).*

But this decision did not end the trouble. In some of his churches the trustees refused to accept the services of the priests appointed by him, and insisted on retaining priests of their own choice. In most cases the trustees were not more to blame than were the clergy. These constant disputes were a source of great scandal and weakness.

When new dioceses were formed the evil seemed to increase. On the arrival of Bishop Connolly at New York in 1816 he found the position of affairs extremely serious. From the beginning, New York seems to have been particularly unfortunate in the frequent recurrence of violent disputes between the trustees and their ecclesiastical superiors; and so exacting had the former become, that they insisted on their right of selecting their own pastors, on the ground that those who supplied the funds should have a right to appoint the ministers. They arrogated to themselves the power of fixing the priests' salary, and of raising it or lowering it according to their merits. The bishop was too weak to cope with the trustees and the few rebellious priests who were in alliance with them, and so bold were his opponents that they actually took steps to secure his deposition.

In Philadelphia, the trouble began under Bishop Carroll, and continued under Dr. Egan (1810-14), the first bishop of Philadelphia. A dispute arose between the bishop and the trustees on the question of appointing pastors, and enlarging the cathedral. The trustees were backed by some of the clergy, and the bishop was quite unfit to meet such a delicate situation. After his

* Shea, *Life of Dr. Carroll*, pp. 448 *sqq.*

death the administration of the diocese of Philadelphia promised to be so embarrassing that three or four whom the Holy See wished to appoint declined the honour, and from 1814 till 1820 Philadelphia was left under the care of an administrator. At last, in 1820, Dr. Conwell, a priest of Armagh, accepted the position.

He was soon involved in a bitter dispute with the pastor of his cathedral, who was supported against the bishop by the trustees. The pastor was excommunicated, but he continued his ministrations. The bishop withdrew to St. Joseph's, whither he was followed by most of the people. He hoped that the election of a new board of trustees might end the trouble, but at the election (1822), which was marked by scenes of violence, his opponents again secured a majority. The Propaganda condemned the schismatics of St. Mary's in 1822, but without effect. At last, worn out by the opposition, Bishop Conwell signed a compromise. By this it was agreed that the bishop should appoint the priests and notify the trustees. If the trustees were not satisfied with their pastor they might lodge their objections with the bishop, and then, three ecclesiastics representing the bishop should meet three trustees. If the mixed committee could not agree, the matter was to be referred to arbitration. This agreement was condemned at Rome in 1827, and as the schism continued, and as the bishop was quite unable to deal with such a situation, an administrator was appointed, who acted till 1830, when Dr. Kenrick was appointed coadjutor.*

The dispute in Philadelphia was brought under the notice of Propaganda, which issued a definite code of instructions as to the attitude to be adopted towards Lay Trusteeism (1822). Where trustees were already in existence nothing remained but to endeavour to persuade them to co-operate with the ecclesiastical authorities. But, for the future, the bishop should endeavour to secure legal possession of the ecclesiastical property, and, to prevent the property passing to his relations at

* Shea, *History of the Church*, pp. 214-24.

his death, he should make two copies of his will, one of which he might retain, the other being lodged with some trustworthy agent. If it were impossible for the bishop to secure legal possession of the property, then he should insist on the trustees abandoning all claims to the appointment of pastors, and if they refused to meet his demands, he should refuse to bless their church or to send them a priest.

When the provincial council of Baltimore met in 1829 the question of Trusteeism demanded very careful attention. In the letter addressed by the fathers of the council to the Pope they complained that the usurpation of lay trustees had become dangerous on account of the peculiar situation of the country, and the presence of people from so many different nationalities. They laid down; (1) that on account of the many scandals that had arisen no church should be consecrated unless it were handed over to the bishop under contract for public worship; (2) that the *Jus Patronatus* should in no case be conceded, no matter how much an individual may have done for the Church; (3) that the *Jus Institutionis* was opposed to the doctrine and discipline of the Church; (4) that bishops should suspend all priests who encouraged such a system; and (5) that if a layman attempted either to appoint or to impede the bishop's appointment, the church should be laid under interdict. They furthermore, ordained that priests should be prepared to change missions at the order of their bishops.*

These salutary regulations did not, however, put an end to the scandalous disputes. Bishop Dubois, who had been consecrated bishop of New York in 1826, endeavoured to break down the system, but being out of touch to some extent with the people, who were mostly Irish, he had very little success. The trustees opposed him resolutely. They maintained a suspended priest in one of the churches, and expelled a catechist, who had been appointed by the bishop, from one of the schools. The bishop issued a pastoral letter, in which he care-

* *Decrees, Collectio Lacensis*, Vol. III., pp. 26-34.

fully explained the position of the Catholic Church in such matters, but the trustees were firm, and refused to submit. They even went so far as to threaten to cut off the bishop's salary unless he gave them the clergymen they desired. In 1837, Bishop Dubois asked for a coadjutor, and the Rev. John Hughes, pastor of St. John's, Philadelphia, was appointed.

Dr. Hughes, who was born in Ireland in 1798, and who at an early age emigrated to America, entered Mount St. Mary's in 1817. After his ordination he was appointed pastor in Philadelphia, and soon acquired a great reputation both for his administrative and controversial powers. Young, active, determined, he was pre-eminently fitted to deal with the troubles in New York, while the fact of his being an Irishman deprived the trustees of one of their most powerful weapons. He determined to completely crush a system which had produced such disastrous results. Hence, on his arrival in New York, he openly appealed to the faithful to assist him against the trustees, and at a public meeting in 1838 he secured the adhesion of the greater part of his flock. Fortunately, at the time, owing to the reckless expenditure of the trustees, five of the eight churches then existing in New York were in a state of bankruptcy, and were sold by the sheriff. Dr. Hughes secured the property, and, in spite of difficulties thrown in his way by the state, put an end to the tyranny. In a pastoral letter issued in 1842 Dr. Hughes fully explained the position of the trustees, and his determination either to restrict them to their proper sphere or abolish them entirely by vesting the ecclesiastical property in the bishop.* By a careful adhesion to the decrees of the synod of Baltimore in the case of new missions the great evils of Trusteeism were gradually lessened.

Fortunately for Philadelphia, Dr. Kenrick, who had been consecrated bishop in 1830, proved himself equal to the occasion. Though on his arrival in Philadelphia he found the doors of his cathedral and of the city

* *Works of Dr. Hughes*, Vol. I., pp. 314-27.

churches closed against him, he was not discouraged. He appealed from the trustees to the Catholic people, and the people loyally responded. By securing the election of suitable men, by insisting on their due submission to ecclesiastical authority, and by carrying out the decrees of Baltimore in all new churches, Bishop Kenrick practically put an end to Trusteeism in the Church at Philadelphia. To these two bishops, Dr. Kenrick of Philadelphia, and Dr. Hughes of New York, both natives of Ireland, the Church of America is much indebted for suppressing, or at least purifying, a system that was fraught with the greatest dangers.

The Trustee system proved undoubtedly a serious obstacle to the progress of the Church in the United States. Its influences for evil were not confined to any particular places. In Philadelphia, New York, New Orleans, Charleston, and Louisiana incessant disputes and schism were its results. Some of the clergy lent their assistance to the trustees against the bishops, and publicly announced their intention of freeing themselves from the tyranny of the "Roman Junta," called the Propaganda. The condemnation of the bishops in 1810 and 1829, and the condemnation of Pius VII. and of Leo XII., were not sufficient to eradicate the evil, but with bishops like Drs. Hughes, Kenrick, and England determined to insist on the due observance of the canons, the elected trustees either disappeared or their authority was restricted to the proper sphere. The Council of Baltimore in 1852 practically put an end to the system.

As a result, the ecclesiastical property was held in trust by the bishops, and transmitted by will to their successors. Such a system, however, was not without its dangers. Some of the states, recognising that the system of elected trustees was discountenanced by the Catholic Church, passed legislation recognising as legal the kind of corporation which the bishops demanded. In 1863, for example, the State of New York arranged that a parochial council, consisting of the bishop, the

vicar-general, the rector, and two laymen selected by the three ecclesiastics, should be recognised as the legal owners of the parochial property. No action of the trustees is valid without the sanction of the bishop; the bishop and his successors, the vicar-general, and rector are *ex-officio* legal trustees, and the property is to be administered according to the rules and discipline of the Catholic Church (Act, 1895).* Very few restrictions are placed on such bodies, and the formalities required for their constitution are very simple. The law in California and in Illinois is even more sympathetic, recognising the bishops who apply for recognition as legal corporations; while in many of the other states facilities corresponding to those of New York are granted to the bishops and clergy. In the last council of Baltimore the bishops recommended the adoption of the New York system, and demanded for the Church the right to administer its property, churches, presbyteries, cemeteries, schools and institutions in conformity with its own decrees.

The population of the United States after the War of Independence amounted to about four millions, but owing to the natural resources of the country and the genuine spirit of liberty which pervaded the constitution, immigrants began to arrive from all the countries of the Old World, so that in forty years the four millions had become fourteen millions. At first, very few emigrated from England or Ireland, owing to the bad feeling existing after the war, and when, later, emigration began, the majority of the emigrants were Protestants from the North of Ireland, who settled in the New England States. The population of Ireland in 1778 was about three millions; it went on increasing till, in 1846, it had reached close on nine millions. With Ireland so overcrowded, and at the same time so impoverished, it was natural that many should turn their eyes to America. The Catholics, especially, went in great numbers. Between the years 1825 and 1850 nearly a million and a half Irish Catholics arrived in America. In the year

* Klein, Appendix B.

1850, the total population of the United States was 19,553,065, of whom 2,245,536 were foreigners by birth, and of the foreign element the percentage of Irish by birth was 42.8.*

It is worthy of note that, according to the Census of 1900 the total population of the United States was over 75 millions, about 15 per cent. of whom were foreigners by birth. Of the latter, the Irish formed 15.6 per cent. of the whole, the Germans 25 per cent., and the Slavs, who in 1850 formed only one-third of one per cent. of the foreign population, constituted then 18.9 per cent. Thus it is evident that the stream of immigration, which flowed from Ireland between the years 1825 and 1860, derives its strength at present mainly from the German and Slav nations.

From the very beginning the earlier colonists, who had arrived before the War of Independence, conceived a strong prejudice against the arrival of foreigners. This was seen in the restrictions imposed in the constitutions of the states on the votes of the immigrants, as well as in the Alien Act passed in 1796, according to which the president was empowered to arrange the conditions under which immigrants might be permitted to remain. In the light of subsequent events a resolution passed by the Hartford Convention in 1812 is not without a glimmer of humour. It was resolved "That the stock of population already in these states is amply sufficient to render this nation in due time sufficiently great and powerful is not a controversial question, and that no person who shall hereafter be naturalised shall be eligible as a member of the Senate or House of Representatives of the States, or capable of holding any authority under the United States." † Though the Alien Act was repealed in 1826, the old jealousy continued, and the dread of being swamped by the immigrants was always before the minds of a large section of the "Native American" element.

* Census Report, 1900.
† Maguire, *The Irish in America*, Chap. XXV.

When, however, it was noticed that the majority of the immigrants arriving were Irish Catholics, the agitation against the foreigner became more bitter. Religious bigotry added fuel to the former jealousy. A violent agitation was begun against everything Catholic. In the press, on the platform, and, worse still, in the pulpit, Catholics were held up as subjects of a foreign power and, therefore, incapable of loyalty to the constitution. Their Church was represented as bound up with the doctrine of the divine right of kings and absolute rule, and, therefore, incapable of appreciating the blessings of republican rule. Under the influence of the storm of passion the Americans forgot the services rendered to their country by Catholic foreigners, Irishmen and Frenchmen; they forgot, too, that, according to their own official reports the bone and sinew of the country, the men who were to build up America, were not the descendants of the early New England settlers, but the immigrants and the children of immigrants. The fight was directed mainly against the Irish Catholics, and, to their shame be it said, many of their bitterest opponents in the struggle were their own Protestant immigrant countrymen.

Feeling became very bitter in 1833. On account of the objections urged by Catholics against the reading of the Protestant version of the Scriptures in the schools the cry was raised that the Catholics wished to drive the Bible from the schools, and prevent people from reading it. The Bible in danger was the watchword of press and pulpit and platform. The Catholic bishops met at Baltimore in 1833, and the pastoral letter issued from this synod shows that they appreciated the seriousness of the crisis. They exhorted the Catholics to reply to the calumnies repeated against them by doing good to their opponents, by continuing to fulfil their duties of loyalty and obedience to the constitution, and by uniting with their fellow-citizens to maintain the liberties of the country. The New England States, the stronghold of Puritanism, were the centre of the agitation, and there, at the city of Charleston, the storm burst in 1834.

It was rumoured that a novice was detained in one of the city convents against her will, and on the pretext of rescuing her the convent of the Ursulines at Charleston was attacked and burned to the ground (1834).* Boston was for a few days in the hands of a violent mob, who attempted to destroy the buildings identified with the Catholic religion. Even the Catholic graveyard at Lowell was desecrated, and it required all the efforts of Bishop Fenwick to restrain his flock, mostly Irish, from acts of retaliation. The example of Boston proved contagious. Anti-Catholic mobs assembled in the other great cities, but the determined attitude adopted by the Catholics in many places prevented the destruction of property.

To add fuel to the flames, the awful disclosures of Maria Monk were forged and published broadcast. This woman, representing herself as having been an inmate of the *Hôtel Dieu*, one of the great convents of Montreal, undertook to enlighten the public about the scandalous lives led by the nuns in such institutions. It was useless to deny the truth of her allegations, and to prove that Maria Monk was not what she represented herself to be, and was never in a convent in her life. A commission was appointed to examine her charges, and pronounced them to be without foundation. But religious intolerance, once keenly aroused, cannot be quenched even by the findings of a judicial commission. In Philadelphia, Bishop Kenrick lodged an objection against the rule obliging the Catholic children to read the Protestant version of the Scriptures. Such a simple matter provoked scenes of lawless violence in the streets of Philadelphia (1844). Two Catholic churches and one convent were delivered to the flames, the houses of prominent Catholic citizens were pillaged by the mob, and twenty persons lost their lives. The city authorities stood by unwilling to suppress the disturbance by force till they were shamed into action by the indignation of all decent men in the States. General Cadwallader advanced on the city with a large military force,

* *Burning of the Convent of Charleston*, Boston, 1877.

and, after a desperate struggle, in which heavy guns were freely used by both parties, he succeeded in quelling the rioters, and in restoring peace to the city.

The feeling all over America was intense, and attempts were made to re-enact the scenes of Philadelphia in New York and Boston. In New York, however, thanks to the energy and determination of Archbishop Hughes, the Catholics made every preparation to defend their churches and property. The city authorities became alarmed at the fearful consequences which might ensue if the proposed anti-Catholic demonstration were permitted, and they determined to avert such a disaster by preventing the assembly. New York was saved from disgrace, and the violent outbreaks were ended.

But the spirit that provoked these attacks still remained. A Native American Party was formed in politics with the object of excluding all foreigners, but especially all Irish Catholics, from offices of trust in the United States. It was developed as a secret society, and was generally referred to as the "Know Nothing Party." By its influence disturbances were organised in New York, New Hampshire, Maine, and St. Louis (1854), in which many lives were lost and much valuable property destroyed. In the election of 1854 the "Know Nothing Party" adopted a separate ticket, and had some measure of success, but the vast body of the citizens were opposed to such tactics. Two years later the same party proposed Fillimore as a candidate for the presidency, but he got no support. The society was ridiculed on all sides, and even its most prominent members were ashamed to admit their connection with such an organisation. Besides, the slavery question was too burning to allow people to think of such side issues, while the generous loyalty of the Irish Catholic citizens to their adopted country in the dark days of the Civil War silenced their enemies at least for the time.

Still, the rapid development of the Catholic population and organisation in the United States was enough

to excite the jealousy of the sects, and, once more, a new campaign was opened to check the growth of Catholic influence. The association, on this occasion, was known as the "American Protective Association," or, by the more familiar title, the A. P. A.* Unlike the "Know Nothing Party," the A. P. A. did not adopt a separate political ticket, but sought, rather, to capture the local Republican or Democratic organisations. Nor did it exclude foreigners, as its predecessors had done. Foreigners were freely admitted, provided that they were willing to take the oath of the society, and to work for the exclusion of Catholics from all offices of trust and emolument in the States. The first council of the society was established at Clinton, Iowa, in 1887. But its direct opposition to the genius of American liberty prevented its rapid development, and it was only in 1892 that its influence began to be felt.

From 1892 till 1896 it exercised its greatest power. During this period it had secured a strong foothold in Omaha, Kansas City, Detroit, St. Louis, Denver, New York, Pennsylvania, Massachussets, Rhode Island, and California where it was particularly strong and domineering, and where it was ably combated, especially by Father Yorke. For the purposes of gaining recruits it had recourse to the same methods as its predecessors. Instructions to their Catholic flocks signed by eight Catholic bishops were forged and put in circulation, a Papal Bull, calling for the massacre of the Protestants on the Feast of St. Ignatius, 1893, was invented to rouse the feelings of the lower classes, quotations from Jesuit authors, theological works, from the canon law, &c., were either invented or taken from their context, and the newspapers and magazines were filled with diatribes against the Catholic doctrine and the Catholic Church.

The Catholics, naturally, resented such infamous calumnies, and defended themselves warmly in the press and on the platform. Without adopting the tactics of

* For this Association, *cf.* :—Hoar, *Autobiography*, New York, 1904. *North American Review*, CLIX., p. 278; CLXII., p. 658.

their opponents, they took steps to learn the inner working of the A. P. A. Copies of its most confidential instructions and resolutions were secured and published, together with lists of the men found frequenting its meeting-places. Public opinion in America was so strongly aroused that few prominent men cared to identify themselves with such an association. By 1896 the A. P. A. had reached the zenith of its power. The number of its adherents at this period is reckoned by some to have been 2,500,000, and by others 120,000. In this year the association endeavoured to prevent the election of President M'Kinley, and to secure the recognition of some of its principles by the Republican convention. Defeated in both these attempts, and overthrown in many of the local elections, the A. P. A. gradually disappeared from public notice, and though it still retains a nominal existence its membership is small, and its influence on the public life of the country is gone.

(*c*) Development, Synods, Organisation

Maguire, *The Irish in America*, 1867. *Census Reports. The Official Catholic Directory* (Wiltzius), 1886-1909. *The Missionary.* Young, *Catholic and Protestant Countries Compared*, New York, 1900, pp. 591-693. Scannell-O'Neill, *Distinguished Converts to Rome in America*, St. Louis, 1907. Carroll, *The Religious Forces of the United States taken from the Eleventh Census*, New York, 1893. Forbes, *L'Église Catholique au XIX^e^ Siècle*, Paris, 1903, pp. 87-136. *Collectio Lacensis*, Vol. III. (*The Acts and Decrees of the Synods and Councils*, 1791-1869). *Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis*, 1884, Baltimore, 1886. *Collectanea S. C. de Propaganda Fide, seu Decreta, Instructiones, Rescripta pro Apostolicis Missionariis*, Rome, 1893. Smith, *Elements of Ecclesiastical Law*, 6th ed., 3 vols., New York, 1887. Giobbio, *Lezioni di Diplomazia Ecclesiastica*, 2 vols., Rome, 1899-1901.

The development of the Catholic Church in America during the nineteenth century has been one of the most consoling features of the period. In 1785, according to the report furnished by Father Carroll to the Propa-

ganda, there were then about 25,000 in the thirteen states of the Union. At that time, there was no bishop, the number of priests was not more than 30, there was no seminary, no Catholic schools, no religious orders of men or women, and the few churches in existence were hardly worthy of the name.

When the first formal provincial synod was held at Baltimore in 1829, under Archbishop Whitfield, the progress of the Catholic organisation was clearly visible. The Catholic population at this period was reckoned as little short of 500,000. Baltimore had been raised to the rank of a metropolitan see, under which were grouped nine episcopal sees. Thanks mainly to the introduction of the Sulpicians, seminaries had been established for the education of the priesthood, religious orders had been introduced, Catholic primary schools had been opened by the Sisters in many of the great centres, and Catholic colleges established for the higher education of the Catholic youth.

In 1856, owing largely to the immigration of Irish Catholics, the Catholic population had reached close on two million and a half. To minister to the wants of such a large multitude scattered over the very extensive territories of the Union, the Holy See had established seven archbishoprics, and thirty-five bishoprics. The number of priests engaged on these missions was about one thousand seven hundred, over two thousand churches had been built, twenty-four colleges for Catholic boys and several higher academies for the education of girls had been incorporated, and representatives of many of the religious orders had founded branches in the States.

In 1884, on the occasion of the Third National Council of Baltimore, there were present to take part in the deliberations, either personally or by procurators, twelve archbishops and sixty-three bishops, six mitred abbots, thirty-two superiors of religious orders and congregations and eleven rectors of ecclesiastical seminaries. At present the Catholic population is probably

about 14,235,451,* though some authorities put it so high as 17,000,000. If to this were added the Catholic population of the Philippines, acquired by America in the Spanish-American war, the Catholics of the United States and of its dependencies fall little short of twenty-two millions. The Church in the States is perfectly organised, with its hierarchy of over 80 bishops, its numerous and well-trained body of clergy, its cathedrals, churches, universities, colleges, schools and charitable institutions. The Catholic Church in the nineteenth century can boast of no other such success.

The main causes of this rapid development are immigration and conversions from the opposing religious sects. The large stream of immigration from Ireland during the past century contributed most to build up the Church in the United States. In many districts the Church is composed almost entirely of Irish or the children of Irish immigrants, and a glance at the names of the priests and bishops of America shows that the clergy of America are largely recruited from the same source. That many of the Irish fell away from Catholicity is perfectly clear, but the story of such defections has been entirely exaggerated. The systematic persecution and boycott carried on in some places against Irish Catholics, the want of religious and educational facilities, the neglect of the immigrants on their arrival, and the scandal given by the disputes among Catholics referred to above, will go far to explain the alleged defection. These causes have been, however, to a great extent removed. After the influence of the Irish may be reckoned the influence of the immigrant Germans, French, Italians, and Poles. In the early years of the Republic the Church was greatly indebted to France for its missionary priests, religious orders of men and women, and for the liberal financial support given to Catholic American institutions.

Conversions, too, have been more frequent in the United States than in the countries of the Old World.

* *Official Directory*, 1909, p. 1007.

The reason is to be sought for in the staunch adherence of the vast body of American citizens to the principles of Christianity, and their fair-minded appreciation of the claims of the one religious body which confronts the naturalism of the age with a clearly defined and consistent body of doctrine. In 1837, the fathers of the provincial synod of Baltimore referred to the consoling spectacle of the return to the fold of many of their erring brethren. The list of conversions in America has been carefully compiled and published.* Only the more prominent names are referred to, but a glance at this catalogue, containing the names of those distinguished in the army, the law, the administration, and in the arts and sciences, is sufficient to show the strong impression which Catholicism has made upon the American people.

In the early years of the Republic very little organised effort could be made to bring the claims of the Church before the non-Catholic population. But in later years the work has been regularly organised. The congregation of the Paulists was founded by Father Hecker mainly for the purpose of giving missions to non-Catholics. The journal of this Congregation, *The Missionary,* gives an account of these efforts and of their success. Many of the bishops have organised bands of secular priests to carry on the same work in their dioceses, and the older religious orders and congregations have turned their attention to this new sphere of labour. Associations, like the *Catholic Missionary Union,* have been formed to supply the funds necessary for such a campaign. The Missionary Congress in November, 1908, has done much to elicit the support of the American Catholics, while the warm approbation of Pius X., conveyed through Cardinal Gibbons (1908), shows the interest manifested by the Pope in such endeavours. Cardinal Gibbons, in his book, *The Ambassador of Christ,* estimates the number of conversions in his own diocese of Baltimore alone, as 700 or 800 per

* Young, *op. cit.*, 612-32. Scannell-O'Neill, *op. cit.*

year, while Father Doyle, the Superior of the Paulist Fathers, sets down the annual number of conversions at present in the United States as 25,000.

In 1791, Dr. Carroll summoned the first synod held in the United States. Twenty-five priests, representatives of nearly every nation in Europe, responded to his summons from the different Catholic centres in the Union. It was arranged to petition the Holy See for the appointment of a coadjutor who might assist Dr. Carroll in his work of visitation. Regulations were made about the administration of the Sacraments, and the duty of priests to accept a change of mission at the command of their bishop. The question of the means to be provided for the support of the clergy also required careful attention. In the old colonial days the Governor of Maryland had assigned large tracts of land to the Jesuits for the support of their missions, and the revenue accruing from these was almost sufficient for the maintenance of the Church. But with the increase of immigration and with the consequent development of Catholicity, some more general means of support were required. Fortunately, the voluntary system was accepted as the most satisfactory. It was determined to appeal to the people for the support of the clergy and the erection and maintenance of the ecclesiastical buildings; and, as subsequent events have shown, the decision taken in the synod of 1791 seems to have been providential.

In 1810, on the occasion of the consecration of the bishops-elect of Boston, Philadelphia and Bardstown, by Dr. Carroll at Baltimore, an informal synod was held which forbade the use in prayer-books of any version of the Scriptures except the Douay version, and, while permitting the use of the vernacular in the prayers which preceded or followed the essential form of the Sacraments, the bishops ordered that the Mass should be celebrated only in the Latin tongue. They warned the pastors to be untiring in their struggle against dangerous amusements and dangerous books, and they forbade them to admit freemasons to the Sacraments, unless they had

publicly severed their connection with the society. The bishops felt, however, that a regular synod should be called to deal fully with all matters that required attention, and they arranged that such a synod should be held within two years from that date (1st Nov., 1810): but unfortunately the project could not be carried out, and it was only in 1829, when Archbishop Whitfield occupied the see of Baltimore, that the first provincial council of Baltimore and the first formal provincial synod of the United States could be convoked.

The assembly opened on the 4th October, 1829.* Besides the archbishop, there were present Dr. Flaget of Bardstown, Dr. England of Charleston, Dr. Fenwick of Cincinnati, Dr. Rosati of St. Louis, and Dr. Fenwick of Boston. Four other bishops, who were prevented from being present, were represented by procurators. Thirty-eight decrees were passed, dealing principally with the appointments to missions, the rights claimed by the lay trustees, the administration of the Sacraments, and the necessity for the establishment of Catholic schools. The synod laid down that the bishops had a right to send any priest to any mission in their dioceses, and to recall him from it when they thought proper; that, furthermore, priests who were ordained for a certain diocese or who had been incorporated, were not at liberty to leave that diocese without the permission of their bishops, and that, as a rule, bishops should not accept the services of strange priests unless they brought with them testimonial letters from their former bishops. In regard to the lay trustees, the bishops expressed the wish that on account of the abuse of the system of elected trustees, a bishop should not consent to the erection or consecration of a church unless the ownership in trust of the church had been vested in himself. They condemned the claims to the *Jus Patronatus* and the *Jus Institutionis* put forward by some lay benefactors as opposed to the canons of the Church. The decrees were confirmed by the Propaganda in June, 1830.

* *Collectio Lacensis*, Vol. III., pp. 8-35.

In 1833, the second provincial council of Baltimore * was held under the presidency of Archbishop Whitfield. There were present the bishops of Charleston, St. Louis, Boston, New York, Mobile, Detroit and Cincinnati, together with the coadjutor bishop of Bardstown, and the administrator of Philadelphia. The see of Orleans was then vacant. In this synod the boundaries of the existing dioceses were determined, a method of electing bishops was submitted to the Holy See, the erection of a new see at Vincennes for Indiana and part of Illinois was recommended, and a petition was forwarded to Propaganda that the native Indian tribes dwelling beyond the limits of the fixed dioceses should be handed over to the Jesuits. The fathers recommended, also, the establishment of a mission for the negroes who emigrated from the United States to the African colony of Liberia. Provincial synods were held at Baltimore in 1837, under the presidency of Archbishop Eccleston, in 1840, 1843, 1846, and 1849, under the same archbishop, and a provincial council for Oregon at St. Paul's in 1848.

It was felt, however, that with the development of the Church in America, and with the erection of numerous independent metropolitan sees, a plenary council of all the bishops of the United States should be called, so as to ensure united action and discipline. The letter empowering Dr. Patrick Kenrick, Archbishop of Baltimore, to convoke a council, and appointing him apostolic delegate to preside at its deliberations, was signed at Rome by Cardinal Lambruschini in 1851.† There were present the archbishops of Baltimore, Oregon, St. Louis, New Orleans, New York, and Cincinnati, twenty-three suffragan bishops, together with the bishop of California, who was subject directly to the Holy See, and the bishop of Toronto, who was a suffragan of the archbishop of Quebec. The bishop of Vincennes was absent in Europe, and the bishops of Milwaukee and St. Louis were not present for the opening of the Council.

* *Collectio Lacensis*, Vol. III., pp. 36-47.
† *Idem.*, Vol. III., pp. 128-54.

The presence of such an assembly, met together to discuss the affairs of the Catholic Church in the United States at a time when the country was so bitterly divided on the question of slavery, and when the divisions among the Protestant sects were becoming more marked and more numerous, was calculated to create a profound impression on the minds of thinking Americans. The council was opened with all the solemn ceremonial fixed for such an event. The bishops, superiors of religious orders and consultors went in procession, robed in full pontificals, from the archbishop's residence to the cathedral, passing through an immense concourse of people, who treated them with every sign of respect. The council dealt with the introduction of the Roman ritual and ceremonies into the American dioceses, the residence of the bishops, the appointment of diocesan consultors, the censorship of religious books, the incardination of the clergy, the erection of Catholic schools, the duty of the priests to impart personally the Christian doctrine to the children of the parish, the administration of ecclesiastical property, and the establishment of societies for the propagation of the Catholic Faith and of associations of prayer for the conversion of non-Catholics.

The synodal letter addressed to Pius IX. breathed a spirit of loyalty to the Holy See, and of confidence in the future of the American Church. The decrees received the confirmation of the Pope in the same year, 1852; and, in response to the request for the erection of new episcopal sees, Portland, Burlington, Brooklyn, Newark, Erie, Santa Fè, Covington, Quincy, and Natchitoches were created distinct sees, and San Francisco was raised to the dignity of a metropolitan church, with Monterey as a suffragan see, while Upper Michigan was made a vicariate apostolic (1853).

Between the years 1852 and 1866, when the second plenary council of Baltimore was held, provincial synods were convened at New York in 1854, 1860, and 1861; at Baltimore in 1855 and 1858; at St. Louis in 1855 and 1858; at New Orleans in 1855 and 1861, and at Cincinnati

in 1855, 1858, and 1861. During all these years the question of slavery was agitating the States, and the North was being embittered against South; but, in the midst of all the storm, the Catholic Church calmly continued its work, keeping aloof as far as possible from the controversy, and carefully abstaining from doing anything that might make a peaceful solution more difficult. When the war began the Catholics were to the front in the Confederate as well as in the Federal ranks. The war furnished a great opportunity for the manifestation of Christian charity, of which the Church was not slow to avail herself. The clergy risked their lives to carry the consolations of religion to the wounded and dying soldiers, while the Sisters of the different religious congregations gave up the peace and solitude of their convents to undertake the care of the army hospitals. The bishops, while loyal to their respective parties and lending them every encouragement, tried to soften the bitterness of the struggle by enjoining prayers for peace. Such an attitude, so different from that assumed by other religious bodies, was well calculated to make a good impression in America; and to the zeal and devotion of the clergy and the nursing Sisters during the War of Secession may be attributed the otherwise inexplicable fact that so many of the army and navy officers then and since have joined the ranks of the Catholic Church.

The war which began in 1861 was over in 1865. The surrender of General Lee at Appomattox in April of that year, and the capture of Jefferson Davis in May, put an end to the unfortunate struggle. Many reasons made it imperative that a council of the American bishops should be convoked. Such an assembly, called at such a time, would afford another striking proof of the unity of the Catholic Church. Besides, the changed political circumstances required a revision of the ecclesiastical procedure and the adoption of a uniform discipline in all parts of the Union, while, in addition to this, the situation of the negro population, now endowed with all the rights of citizenship, created a new problem for the charity and generosity of the Catholic community.

Dr. Patrick Kenrick, one of the great pillars of the young American Church, had died in 1863, and to his worthy successor, Dr. Spalding,* was entrusted the office of convoking and presiding over the council. It met at Baltimore in October, 1866. There were present, forty-four archbishops or bishops, one episcopal administrator, twenty-two vicars general, nineteen religious superiors, seven rectors of seminaries, and, in addition to these, a great number of theologians and officials.† In one respect, particularly, the second plenary council of Baltimore differed from those held previously. The decadence of the Protestant sects was surely producing its effects, and the spirit of naturalism or semi-rationalism was strongly felt. It was judged well, therefore, that besides its disciplinary decrees, the council should put forward a short exposition of Catholic dogma, especially in regard to the matters that had been the object of the sharpest attack. For this purpose a preliminary commission of theologians had been appointed by Dr. Spalding, and decrees dealing with the principal articles of faith were prepared and passed.

Amongst the subjects touched upon were the existence and nature of revelation, the divine institution of the Church and its unity, the necessity and nature of faith, the authority of the holy Scriptures, the creation, the future life, the invocation of the B. V. M., and of the Saints, while the errors condemned were Indifferentism, Unitarianism, Universalism, Transcendentalism Pantheism, Magnetism, and Spiritism. The disciplinary regulations framed on the model of similar enactments, dealt with the rights and duties of the clergy, the method of electing bishops, the erection of seminaries, ecclesiastical property, the administration of the Sacraments, divine worship, the uniformity of discipline, education, missions and confraternities, the position of the negroes and secret societies. The bishops also agreed to petition the Holy Father that in addition to the

* *Life of the Most Rev. Dr. Spalding*, New York, 1873.
† *Collectio Lacensis*, Vol. III., pp. 323-574.

bishoprics already established, three new sees and one vicariate apostolic should be established in the province of Baltimore, four new sees and three vicariates apostolic in the province of St. Louis, one new see in the province of New York, one in the province of San Francisco, one in the province of Cincinnati, and a vicariate apostolic in the province of Oregon. They requested, too, that Philadelphia should be raised to the dignity of a metropolitan church.

The decrees of the council were approved by Pius IX., and have been since then the model followed by many similar assemblies in Europe. Were there nothing else, the decrees of the second plenary council of Baltimore would be a sufficient testimony to the ability and foresight of the American prelates. Thousands witnessed the solemn ceremonies during the proceedings of the council, and at the last public session the president of the Republic attended in person to show his respect and sympathy for the Catholic Church. The War of Secession, painful as it was in many respects, proved useful in destroying the prejudice till then existing in the minds of many against the Catholic Church.

At the opening of the Vatican Council (8th Dec., 1869) about thirty-five archbishops or bishops were present to represent the Church in the United States. They were by no means unanimous in their support of Papal Infallibility. The majority, following the lead of Dr. Spalding, Archbishop of Baltimore, gave the proposal their strongest support, but a minority, led by Dr. Kenrick, Archbishop of St. Louis, joined the opposition. When the decree was passed and approved, and when, therefore, Papal Infallibility became an article of Catholic Faith, nowhere was it received with greater unanimity than in the United States. The position of Dr. Kenrick was exceedingly difficult. During the deliberations of the Council he had published two pamphlets, *De Pontificia Infallibilitate,* and *Concio in Concilio habenda et non habita,* strongly opposed to the doctrine of Infallibility. His attitude after the decree

had been passed (18th July, 1870) was awaited with interest and not a little anxiety. He announced, however, to the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda his perfect submission to the decree, and on his return home, in reply to the addresses of welcome, having explained his course of action at the Council, he declared that he accepted the decision. His pamphlets were not expressly withdrawn.

Dr. Spalding, another of America's greatest prelates, died in 1872, and was succeeded by Dr. Bayley, who held the see only for five years, and on his death the present distinguished archbishop, Cardinal Gibbons, was transferred from Richmond to Baltimore (1877). It had been long felt that the absence of a representative of the United States in the college of cardinals was a serious drawback, and in 1875 Pius IX. raised the occupant of the See of New York to the dignity of cardinal. Chicago was made a metropolitan see in 1880, and three new dioceses, San Antonio, Kansas City, and Davenport, were established in 1881.

Many questions of ecclesiastical organisation still required to be settled by another plenary council. Before ordering its convocation, Leo XIII. invited the archbishops of the United States to visit Rome, and to explain more fully the wants of their Church and to arrange the matters to be submitted to the council. Dr. Gibbons was appointed apostolic delegate to preside over the assembly which met in Baltimore in 1884. There were present twelve archbishops and sixty-three bishops, together with a large number of abbots, religious superiors, theologians, and officials. The municipal authorities of Baltimore spared no pains to make the stay of the strangers in their city agreeable, and the attitude of all parties was distinctly sympathetic. The third plenary council of Baltimore completed the particular canon law of the United States. It dealt with nearly all the difficult problems that demanded a solution, namely, the rights of the metropolitans, the method of electing bishops, the relations of the rectors with their bishops,

the administration of ecclesiastical property, the establishment of seminaries for the education of clerical students and the course of studies that should be adopted in such institutions, the best means of securing a good Catholic education in the primary and secondary schools, the foundation of a Catholic University, and the course of procedure in ecclesiastical trials and matrimonial causes. The council dealt also with the Negro and Indian problem, and the best means of spreading the gospel among the two races, the home missions, the Propagation of the Faith, and the protection of the Catholic immigrants. It claimed for the Church the right to hold and administer temporal property according to the method approved by the spiritual authorities, namely, that the board of trustees should be nominated by the bishop, not elected, and that the rector should be president of such a board. It condemned secret societies, and exhorted Catholics to join Catholic associations, instead of connecting themselves with such bodies. At the conclusion of their deliberations, the fathers of the council addressed a touching letter to the faithful of the United States. They protested their loyalty to the Holy See, the centre of Catholic unity, they praised the spirit of the American constitution and laws which were so favourable to the development of Catholicity, and, while expressing their absolute confidence that the people could not be led astray easily, they warned them against the current errors of the age, scepticism and materialism.

The main subjects which occupied the attention of the American councils, provincial and national, may be classed under the headings, (1) ecclesiastical property; (2) the appointment of bishops and priests; (3) Catholic education; (4) the question of the native Indians and the Negroes; (5) secret societies and Catholic societies. The first question, the administration of ecclesiastical property, has been dealt with already in connection with Lay Trusteeism. The method of appointing bishops and the status of rectors in the United States require some notice.

The first bishop, Dr. Carroll, was nominated by the little colony of priests, mainly Jesuits, situated for the most part in Maryland. In the appointment to the sees erected subsequently this method of designating the candidate or candidates was not adopted, and in some cases bishops were appointed to America, not on the recommendation of any person in the States, but on the advice of Irish or French bishops. Such a method, however it might be justified owing to the peculiar circumstances of the time, could not prove satisfactory to the American clergy, and afforded some foundation for the charges made against Catholics that they were subject to foreign powers. Dr. Maréchal, the third archbishop of Baltimore (1817-1828), presented an energetic memorial to Rome against foreign interference in the appointment of bishops, which was well received, and the bishops of the province of Baltimore were permitted to present candidates for the future vacant sees, and for those to be established.*

In the second provincial council of Baltimore the question was formally discussed at the suggestion of the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda. It was agreed that until a new ecclesiastical province should be established all the bishops of the United States should have a voice in designating the candidates for vacant sees, and that this could be done best in a provincial synod. Hence, at such assemblies, the bishops should propose the names of priests worthy of appointment either as bishops on the occasion of a vacancy, or as coadjutors. Lest, however, a vacancy should arise when there was no possibility of assembling a provincial council, the individual bishops were exhorted to draw up a list of three priests whom they deemed worthy to succeed them. After the death of the bishop the vicar general should transmit a copy of this document to the metropolitan, and another to the nearest bishop, who should send a special report on the requirements of the diocese to the archbishop. The latter should send on the list, having added other

* André, *Catholicisme aux États Unis,* Vol. I., pp. 74-5.

names, if he so desired, together with the report of the nearest bishop, if such report had been received, to the individual bishops of the province, and all should then write directly to the Propaganda explaining their views. If no such list could be found after the death of the bishop the vicar-general should communicate immediately with the nearest bishop, upon whom in these circumstances devolved the duty of naming three candidates to the archbishop for the consideration of the suffragans. If the nearest bishop took no steps within a reasonable time the archbishop himself should designate three candidates to his suffragans. In the case of a vacancy in the metropolitan church the vicar-general was to transmit the list to the senior bishop of the province, who was to follow the same procedure as the archbishop in case of vacancies in the suffragan sees.* This method was approved by the Propaganda in 1834, and was followed with slight alterations made in 1850 and 1856, in the United States till 1861. The Prefect of the Propaganda communicated with the archbishops of the United States (1859), and requested them to consider what emendations should be introduced in the scheme that had been approved in 1834. Their replies having been received, it was decided (1861) that for the future all bishops of the United States should send to the Propaganda and to the metropolitan every three years the names of the priests whom they thought worthy of the episcopal office. When a vacancy should arise either in the metropolitan church or in one of the suffragan dioceses, a meeting of the bishops of the entire province should be convoked, the qualifications of the different candidates should be discussed, and, the votes having been taken, the result should be communicated to the Congregation of the Propaganda. This method of electing bishops was approved by the second plenary council of Baltimore in 1866.

It was felt, however, that as the development of the Church proceeded, and as the organisation was becom-

* *Collectio Lacensis*, Vol. III., p. 47.

ing complete, the method of electing bishops in the United States should be brought more in line with the discipline existing in other countries, and the clergy should be allowed a voice in the election of their bishops. Hence, at the third plenary council of Baltimore (1884), the question was again discussed, and a new method adopted. When a vacancy occurred in a diocese the diocesan consultors and irremovable rectors should come together under the presidency of the archbishop of the province, or, in case of a vacancy in the metropolitan church, of the senior suffragan, and should select by a secret vote three priests whom they deemed worthy of the episcopal office. The president should transmit the result of the proceedings to the Propaganda. Afterwards, the bishops of the province should come together, and having discussed the qualifications of the candidates chosen by the clergy, and of any others that might be proposed by any of the bishops, they should draw up a list of three names to be recommended to Propaganda. If they should decide to reject the candidates chosen by the clergy they should, however, in their report justify their action. The method of dealing with the election of a coadjutor, or of a bishop, in case of the erection of a new see, differed slightly from that described.

In the beginning, owing to the scattered nature of the missions it was impossible to have fixed parishes the rectors of which should enjoy the full rights of parish priests. The interference of the lay trustees, and the fact that the pioneer priests were recruited from all parts of Europe, made it necessary for the bishops to vindicate their authority over both the clergy and the laity. In the synod held by Dr. Carroll in 1791, he forbade priests to absolve penitents without having previously secured the approbation of the bishop or of the vicar-general. The first provincial synod of Baltimore (1829) declared that the bishops had the right of appointing priests to missions or recalling them as they should deem best for religion. They added, however, that by this declaration they did not wish to destroy the parochial

rights recognised already in New Orleans, or the privileges conceded by the Holy See to the religious orders. Furthermore, it was decreed that a priest who had been ordained for a particular diocese, or had been canonically co-opted, should not leave that diocese without the permission of the bishop, and that in districts where more than one priest was engaged the bishop should appoint some individual pastor who should have complete charge of the mission. The fourth provincial council of Baltimore (1840), while holding firmly by the right of the bishops to appoint or recall pastors, laid down that to the priest who had been named pastor belonged the administration of the church, and to him all the other priests were subject. Besides, in the distribution of the revenues, they considered that his special rights and privileges should be taken into consideration. In the first plenary council of Baltimore (1852) it was agreed that it would be desirable if each bishop should define clearly the ecclesiastical districts, but the power of changing these limits, and of designating the priests to whom the administration of the districts should be confided, was still entirely in the bishops' hands.

The question of establishing parishes, the rectors of which should enjoy full parochial rights, was carefully discussed at the second plenary council of Baltimore (1866); and the fathers declared that, though it was desirable that parish priests should be appointed in the United States, as in other countries, yet they did not consider that the time had come for taking such a step. The discipline of the American Church should, however, be brought into conformity gradually with the general canon law. They laid down that throughout the States, especially in the larger cities, well-defined districts should be assigned to each church, and that the rector of such a district should enjoy parochial or quasi-parochial rights. The bishops might still remove or transfer such rectors, but they were exhorted not to do so unless for a grave cause. That a man might be deemed worthy of being appointed a rector he should have given, at least,

five years' satisfactory service in the diocese, and should have passed an examination held by the bishop, assisted by two priests.

The fathers of the third plenary council of Baltimore (1884) did not consider that the time had come when the canonical regulations regarding parochial benefices could be carried out in their entirety. But they laid down that in each diocese a certain number of missions should be selected, which should be regarded as parishes, and the rectors of which should be irremovable in the same sense in which parish priests are irremovable. The number of such rectors in any particular diocese should be one in ten of the priests engaged there, and this proportion should not be exceeded for twenty years after the promulgation of the decrees. That a person should be appointed an irremovable rector he should have given at least ten years' satisfactory service, and should have passed the required *concursus*. When a vacancy occurred the bishop should announce the *concursus*, which was to be held in the presence of himself or his vicar-general, assisted by at least three of the diocesan examiners. The examiners should report to the bishop on the fitness or unfitness of the candidates, but it belonged solely to the bishop to make the appointment from the ranks of those who were deemed worthy.

Cathedral chapters have not been introduced into the Church in the United States, though Dr. Kenrick was anxious that such a step should have been taken at the second plenary council of Baltimore. There, however, it was decreed that the bishop should select some prudent priests who would aid him with their advice on all difficult questions, and assist him in the administration of the diocese. But it was reserved for the third plenary council (1884) to lay down definite rules on this subject. Diocesan consultors were to be appointed in each diocese to assist the bishop with their suggestions. The number fixed for the individual dioceses was six or four, or, if it were impossible to have so many, at least two. Half of these should be appointed by the bishop directly, and

the other half by the bishop on the nomination of the clergy of the diocese. From the list of three names presented by the clergy the bishop should make the selection. The consultors were elected for three years, and could not be removed without serious cause. The bishop was bound to seek their advice in regard to the convocation of synods, the dismemberment of a parish, the handing over of a parish to the care of a religious order, the appointments to the seminary, the election of new consultors, and in the alienation of ecclesiastical property of considerable value.*

(*d*) Catholic Education and Missions

Burns, *The Catholic School System in the United States*, New York, 1908. Walsh, *Historical Sketch of the Catholic Parochial Schools in Boston*, Boston, 1901. Walsh, *The Early Irish Catholic Schools of Lowell, Mass*, Boston, 1901. Dexter, *A History of Education in the United States*, New York, 1904. Considine, *A Brief Account of Catholic Educational Institutions of New York*, New York, 1904. *The Catholic Parochial Schools of the United States* (*United States Bureau of Education*, Chap. XXI., 1904). Rivaux, *Life of Mother St. John Fontbonne, Foundress of the Sisters of St. Joseph*, New York, 1887. Trahey, *The Brothers of the Holy Cross*, Notre Dame, 1907. *Memorial Volume of the Centenary of the Seminary of St. Sulpice*, Baltimore, 1891. *History of Georgetown College*, Washington, 1876. Hill, *Historical Sketch of the St. Louis University*, St. Louis, 1879. *A Brief History of the University of Notre Dame*, 1842-1892, Notre Dame, 1892. *The Catholic Summer School of America: Annual Report of Department of the Interior* (*Education*), Vol. I., 1894-95, pp. 1065-67. Sheedy, *The Story of the Catholic Summer School: Champlain Educator*, Sept., 1904. Shea, *History of the Catholic Missions among the Indians*, 1592-1854, New York, 1856. *Annual Report of the Indian and Negro Missions* (since 1884). *The Missionary.*

From the very beginning Catholics endeavoured to erect primary and secondary schools where their children might be educated without danger to their faith or morals. In Maryland such schools had been established in the colonial days, and in spite of persecution some of them continued a precarious existence during the eighteenth century. In Philadelphia, a large school, St.

* *Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis*, Vol. III., pp. 14-16.

Mary's, was opened in 1784, and was supported mainly by fees, donations, and the results of charity sermons and bazaars. The example of St. Mary's was followed according as new congregations were formed in Philadelphia. So also in Baltimore and New York Catholic schools were established at a very early period, and in some districts the Catholics were the pioneers in educational matters.

Naturally enough, at the time, there was no state system of schools. Such schools were in the hands of private societies, but the states contributed a certain amount to the funds of these societies. The religion taught in the schools, the teachers, the reading books, the version of the scriptures employed, were Protestant. In a few cases the Catholics applied for some share of the grant given to assist their primary schools, and they were successful in New York and Lowell. In the former city St. Peter's school received a grant from the state funds in 1806, St. Patrick's in 1816, and by an Act of 1820 the commissioners of the common schools' fund were empowered to pay the Catholic Benevolent Society a proportion of the fund for the support of an orphan asylum.* In Lowell, a compromise was arranged, so that the Catholic schools were adopted into the school system, and received grants in aid for a period of sixteen years.†

But it was only in a few places that such assistance could be expected, and hence the burthen of building and supporting their schools fell upon the Catholics themselves. The schools were generally either in the basement of the church or built in close proximity to the church, and were managed by the elected trustees. Suitable teachers could not be procured easily, and when they were procured it was difficult to pay them. The priests who had come from France and from other parts of the Continent, where the primary schools were in the hands of religious societies, naturally longed for the day

* Burns, *The Catholic School System in the United States*, pp. 360-61.
† *Idem.*, p. 286.

when similar bodies could be founded in the United States. The Carmelite nuns were brought from Antwerp in 1790 by Father Neale, afterwards archbishop of Baltimore, but being a cloistered community they were unable to give much assistance in education till they changed their rules in 1830. In 1792, the Poor Clares arrived, and settled in Georgetown, but they were not a success, and returned to France in 1804. The teaching communities founded in America itself were more successful. Miss Lalor, the foundress of the Visitation nuns in America, opened a free school in Georgetown in 1799, and, having been joined by some companions, she established a community with vows in 1812. In 1816, the house was approved by the Holy See as a convent of the Visitation order. This body soon acquired a number of boarding schools and common schools. The Sisters of Charity, founded by Mrs. Seton, according to the rules of the French Sisters of Charity (1812), spread very rapidly in the States. Before the year 1850, fifty-eight foundations devoted principally to education, had been established, and at present the Sisters of Charity have charge of over 120,000 pupils in their primary schools. The Sisters of Loretto were founded in Kentucky in 1812, and the Sisters of Nazareth in 1813. Both societies soon acquired schools and academies in the neighbouring states.

The presence of these religious orders of women made it possible for Catholics to maintain their primary and secondary schools. The Sisters were willing to work under peculiarly trying circumstances. They were devoted to their profession, and their wants being few and simple they required little for their support. Encouraged by the presence of such bodies and by the progress already made, the fathers of the first plenary council of Baltimore (1829) urged that, on account of the danger to the faith of the children, schools should be established, in which the young, while being instructed in letters, might be taught the principles of faith and morals. Efforts were also made to arrange for suitable

class books for the Catholic schools. In Baltimore, Archbishop Whitfield made great efforts to carry out this decree. Before 1838, nineteen Catholic schools were established in his diocese.* Philadelphia had begun well, but the trustee factions were disastrous to the schools. Dr. Kenrick, after his appointment in 1830, put down the factions, and, aided by Father Hughes, afterwards archbishop of New Work, succeeded in introducing Catholic schools into the great centres of his diocese. Bishop Dubois in New York, Bishop Fenwick in Boston, Bishop England in Charleston, and Bishops Dubourg and Rosatti in St. Louis were indefatigable in their efforts to found Catholic schools.

With the rise of different sects amongst the Protestants, the states felt it necessary to support the principle of undenominationalism in the schools, and in the few places, like Lowell and New York, where Catholic schools had been in the receipt of state endowment, such funds were withdrawn. The burden of supporting their own schools fell entirely on the Catholics, who were at the same time obliged to contribute their share to the support of the public schools. This was admittedly a grievance of which they had just reason to complain, and some of their Protestant fellow-citizens were anxious that such an anomaly should be removed.

In New York the funds for the support of the primary schools were administered by the public school society, which was nominally non-sectarian, but in reality intensely Protestant. The teachers were generally Protestant, the school books Protestant in their tone, and the version of the Bible to be used in the schools Protestant. In 1840, Governor Seward, in his message to the Legislature, urged strongly that this glaring inequality should be remedied by the establishment of schools where children might be taught by teachers of their own religious persuasion. Bishop Hughes was absent at the time, but his vicar general, thinking the opportunity favourable, called a meeting of the trustees of the

* Burns, p. 258.

churches to draft a petition to the Common Council praying that a share of the common school fund should be devoted to the Catholic schools. Nearly all the Protestant sects immediately protested against such a change, and the City Council rejected the petition. When Dr. Hughes returned he threw himself into the struggle with characteristic energy. Meetings of the Catholics were called, and stirring addresses delivered by him. Public opinion was aroused by the discussion, and feeling reached a high pitch when, after a two days' debate before the Common Council, in which Dr. Hughes ably stated the Catholic case, the petition was again rejected.

The Catholics determined to carry their case before the Legislature at Albany, where, owing to the favourable attitude of the governor, they hoped to secure redress. But their opponents appealed to the anti-Catholic prejudices of the majority, by misrepresenting the Catholic demands, and by raising the cry of Protestantism and the Bible in danger. The Legislature postponed the question till the elections should be held. The candidates of both parties were pressed to pledge themselves against any concession to the Catholics, and Bishop Hughes determined at the last moment to nominate an independent ticket. The mass of the people stood by him loyally, though there was no hope of success. The number of votes cast for the Catholic candidate frightened his opponents, and in 1842, though the Catholic schools were still denied any share in the funds, the public school society was practically suppressed, and the general state legislation for purely undenominational education introduced into the city of New York.

The struggle undertaken by Dr. Hughes in New York even if it failed to secure any relief for the Catholics, had the good effect of rendering the public school system in the city really undenominational. In spite of the No Popery agitation, and the cry of the Bible in danger, the other states gradually followed the example. But in Boston, so late as 1859, a schoolboy was punished for not reciting the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Command-

ments according to the Protestant version. The schoolboys rose in rebellion, and were joined by the Catholic young men. The bishop wrote an indignant letter against such rules, and, to put an end to the conflict, the rules prescribing such subjects were withdrawn. Since the election of Catholics to the school boards the dangers of the public school system have been diminished very much, but the principle of the exclusion of religion from education still remains, and it is against this principle that the Catholics continue to protest.

The bishops made renewed efforts to develop the Catholic parochial schools. New orders of women were introduced from Ireland and from the Continent, or were founded in America, so that at present there is engaged in the work of education an immense number of nuns belonging to different congregations, such as the Sisters of Charity, the Sisters of Mercy, the Sisters of Notre Dame, the Sacred Heart Sisters, the Ursulines, the Presentation, Visitation, Benedictine, Dominican, and Franciscan Sisters, the Sisters of the Holy Cross, of St. Joseph, of Providence, of Nazareth, of Loretto, and of the Holy Name. Most of the Sisters undertake parochial schools in connection with an academy or boarding school, and the fees received in the latter help somewhat in supporting the primary school.

It was not, however, so easy to find religious orders of men for the boys' schools. Lay teachers were employed in the beginning, but, from the circumstances of the country, the supply of qualified teachers was necessarily very limited. Attempts were made by Father Nerinckz, the founder of the Loretto Sisters, to inaugurate a religious society of men devoted to the work of education in 1821, and by Bishop Flaget in 1826, but without success. In 1828, Brother Boylan arrived from Ireland in New York, and a society was formed under the title of "The Brothers of Charity in the City of New York for the education of the Poor," * but owing to certain suspicions aroused against the superior, the society was

* Burns, p. 275.

dissolved (1829). The Christian Brothers, founded by John Baptist de la Salle in 1679, came from France to Montreal. From here they were invited by Archbishop Eccleston (1846) to the United States. They spread rapidly, and have acquired houses in many of the dioceses, Baltimore, New York, Brooklyn, Albany, St. Louis, New Orleans, Detroit, &c. In many cases they set up secondary schools in connection with the parochial schools, but some years ago they received an order from Rome to confine themselves to the object of their institute, namely, the education of the children of the poor. In 1845, Bishop O'Connor of Pittsburg brought over Presentation Brothers from Cork, but a series of peculiar accidents scattered the community He then appealed to Dr. MacHale, who had established the Franciscan Brothers in the diocese of Tuam. Six of them went to America in response to the appeal and opened schools in the diocese of Pittsburg (1852). Bishop Hughes introduced another colony of Christian Brothers from Europe in 1845, while Father Dolan founded the Brothers of St. Patrick.

The bishops of America have always strongly insisted on the necessity of establishing parochial schools. The first plenary council of Baltimore (1852) laid it down that schools should be erected in the vicinity of each church, and that a competent staff of teachers should be maintained. The provincial councils of New York (1854), New Orleans (1856) and Cincinnati (1858) endorsed and emphasised this direction. The second council of Baltimore (1866) declared that the public schools were intrinsically dangerous. Hence, the fathers of the council urged the pastors to establish parochial schools wherever possible, and to hand them over to the care of religious orders of men and women if such could be found, but if these could not be introduced then the lay teachers should be selected with great care. Parents were to be warned to send their children to the parochial schools, and to do all they could to promote their success. But in many districts the establishment of parochial schools

might be impossible, and in such districts the pastors were exhorted to found catechetical societies for the religious instruction of those frequenting the public schools, and to bring the children together in the church on Sundays and holidays to be taught the elements of the Christian doctrine. According to the instruction issued from the Congregation of the Propaganda (Nov., 1875) children should be prevented from going to the public schools, Catholics should perfect the system of parochial schools so as to bring them to the level of the public schools, but, at the same time, in particular cases, the bishop might give permission to attend the latter, where the circumstances seemed to warrant it, and where proper remedies for lessening the dangers were undertaken.

The third plenary council of Baltimore (1884) devoted a great deal of attention to the question of education. Following the lines of the Propaganda instruction of 1875, and the letter of Leo XIII. to the bishops of France (Feb., 1884), the fathers of the council strongly urged Catholics to send their children to the parochial schools, but wherever this was not possible the bishop might permit the parents to send their children to the public schools. They ordered, that in parishes where a parochial school did not yet exist, the pastor should establish such a one within two years from the promulgation of the decrees, unless the bishop for grave reasons extended the period. The pastor who neglected this decree, and who took no notice of the admonitions of the bishop, should be removed, and the parish which was unwilling to assist in the erection or maintenance of the schools should be reproved by the bishop.

In order to raise the standard of the parochial schools each bishop should establish a diocesan commission, whose duty should be to examine aspirants to the office of teacher, and to issue diplomas, without which no teacher should be employed Another diocesan commission should be established to visit the schools once or twice a year to examine the work, and to make a report to the education committee and to the bishop. These

directions were excellent, but, unfortunately, they have been carried out in only a few dioceses. In order that a sufficient number of trained teachers, both men and women, might be ready to undertake the work, the superiors of the religious orders were exhorted to found normal schools for the training of the teachers belonging to religious societies, while the priests, both secular and regular, who had already opened normal schools for the training of lay teachers, were praised for their efforts, and exhorted to continue them.

The steps taken by the third plenary council of Baltimore to develop the system of parochial schools, and to raise the standard of teaching therein, were productive of good results. According to the statistics of 1909, there were in the States 4,703 parochial schools giving instruction to 1,197,913 children, while in the Catholic orphanages 44,966 were being reared and instructed. If to these figures be added the number of those of the better classes who receive their early instruction either at home or in private schools, it will be seen that the vast majority of the Catholics of the United States have been thoroughly loyal to the line of conduct traced out for them by their bishops and by the Propaganda.*

Nevertheless the fact still remains that the Catholics while contributing their share to the public school funds are obliged, in addition, to support their own parochial schools. To remedy this glaring inequality Dr. Ireland, the archbishop of St. Paul's, opened negotiations with the authorities of the State of Minnesota in regard to two parochial schools, Faribault and Stillwater. According to the arrangement made between the archbishop and the Education Board the school buildings were to be let to the public school board, while the teachers and the secular education of the schools were to be subject to the same body. The programme was to be of exactly the same kind as in the public schools, that is to say, entirely undenominational, but religious instruction might be given to Catholic children in the school outside the hours

* *Official Directory* (Wiltzius), 1909, p. 1007.

devoted to secular instruction, and by the teachers to whom the secular education was entrusted. On these conditions the public school board undertook to recognise the teachers and to pay their salary. Such a plan according to the idea of the archbishop, while satisfying the religious convictions of the Catholics, would relieve them of the financial inequality, and, if it worked well, might be generally accepted by the different states. Others considered that this system, known as "the Faribault system," was hardly in keeping with the decrees of the third plenary council of Baltimore, and might prove a danger to the whole system of parochial schools. A bitter controversy broke out, in which many matters bearing only very remotely on the Faribault compromise, were hotly discussed. The question was submitted to the Propaganda in 1892, and it was decided that, although the decrees of the plenary council still retained their force, the system inaugurated by Dr. Ireland might be tolerated. The decision seemed to favour Dr. Ireland, and should have ended the controversy, but his opponents interpreted the toleration of the Holy See as a tacit condemnation, and renewed their attacks with vigour. Leo XIII. addressed a letter to the bishops of the province of New York (1892), in which he laid down that, though in a particular case a bishop might and ought to make exceptions, the general laws passed by the synod of Baltimore on parochial schools still remained in force. In November of the same year a meeting of the American archbishops was held in New York, at which the apostolic delegate, Mgr. Satolli, presented to the bishops fourteen propositions on the school question, taken for the most part from former American synods. These were accepted by the prelates, and Leo XIII. then addressed a letter to the American hierarchy, declaring his wish that the bishops and clergy should still strive to maintain the parochial schools, but leaving it to the judgment of the bishop to decide when Catholic children might, without danger, frequent the public schools. The scheme of Dr. Ireland remained untouched by such a decision.

In regard to the extension classes, which are a noted feature of the public schools system, very little has been done yet in the parochial schools. This is a very serious defect that might be remedied easily enough, especially in the large cities, where several parishes could combine for the erection of such institutions. But considerable attention has been paid to the establishment of secondary schools for both boys and girls. In this department the influence of the religious orders has been considerably felt. The orders and congregations principally engaged in the education of the boys are the Jesuits, the Benedictines, the Franciscans, the Vincentians, the Marists, together with different congregations of Lay Brothers, while nearly all the religious congregations of women undertake academies or high schools for the education of the girls. According to the statistics of 1909 the number of colleges for boys is 213, and for girls 708.* How far some of these are entitled to rank as secondary schools is not quite clear.

Great efforts have also been made to provide seminaries for the education of candidates for the priesthood. Bishop Carroll founded St. Mary's Seminary in Baltimore in 1791, handing it over to the care of the Sulpicians. Though other institutions were formed, still many of the bishops of the United States were dependent upon foreign colleges, such as Montreal and All Hallows, Dublin. In 1859, a college for the clerical students of the United States was opened in Rome, another was erected at Louvain (1857), while many American students receive their education at St. Sulpice, Paris, and Innsbruck, and other establishments on the Continent. Many dioceses have established preparatory seminaries, and a theological seminary; others have a preparatory seminary, while others are depending entirely on some of the older home or foreign colleges. According to the statistics of 1909 the number of preparatory and theological seminaries in the States is 80, and the number of students frequenting such institutions is put down as 5,687.

* *Official Directory*, p. 1007.

To complete the system of secondary schools, as well as to improve the condition of the seminaries, the bishops of the United States were anxious to establish a Catholic University. The fathers of the second plenary council of Baltimore (1866) expressed the wish that such a university could be established, but they considered that the time had not yet come for such an important step. Some of the Catholic colleges, for example Georgetown, St. Louis, Notre Dame, &c., had been recognised as universities by the educational authorities of the different states, but such institutions could not meet the precise want which the fathers of Baltimore contemplated. Encouraged by some generous contributions for this purpose, the bishops at the third plenary council of Baltimore undertook to begin the work of founding a Catholic University in the United States, and their resolution received the approval of Leo XIII. An executive committee, consisting of six archbishops or bishops, one priest, and three laymen, with the Cardinal Archbishop of Baltimore as chairman, was appointed to organise the work.

Washington, the civil capital of the States, was selected as the most suitable situation for the new university; and in 1889, on the occasion of the centenary celebration of the establishment of the hierarchy, the new university was opened in the presence of the apostolic delegate, the bishops of America, and the representatives of the government. President Harrison sent a telegram of congratulation and good wishes, and similar messages were received from Ireland, England, Canada, France, Italy and Belgium. Eminent professors had been secured in the States or from the Continent. Besides the theological faculty, the faculties of philosophy, of law, of literature, and of science have been opened. Though the university has obtained a considerable measure of success, yet several circumstances have combined to retard its speedy development. Its separation from the great Catholic centres, and its close proximity to a well-established Catholic university like Georgetown, the want

of unanimity amongst its supporters, the bitterness excited by some of the latter-day American controversies, and, finally, the failure of its financial agent, have prevented it from developing so rapidly as might have been expected.

The Catholic Summer School of America * has also played an important part in higher education during the last seventeen years The scheme was inaugurated in 1892 by Monsignor Loughlin, Father Sheedy (the first president of the school), and Mr. Mosher. In February, 1893, the Catholic Summer School received its charter from the Regents of the State of New York, and a grant of land, 450 acres, situated along the shores of Lake Champlain, was presented by the Delaware and Hudson Railway. From 1893 till 1895 the school was conducted in the city of Plattsburg, but buildings were rapidly erected on the grounds of the school, and since 1896 the lectures have been delivered, and accommodation has been found for the students on the Summer School's own grounds. The aim of the school is partly educational, partly social, partly recreative. The lectures are delivered by men who are themselves experts on the subjects which they undertake to handle. By means of these lectures Catholic views on philosophy, history and science are put before a class of students who may not have had previously an opportunity of hearing a presentation of the facts from the lips of competent Catholic masters, and who themselves in turn are enabled to lend a helping hand in the spread of such views to a still larger class. The social and recreative sides of the school are not neglected. The Catholic Summer School, situated in such a beautiful district, has become a vacation resort for a large number of Catholic families. In fact, it has grown into immense proportions, and has become a popular and practical university which has done

* For Catholic Summer School, *cf.*:—*The Story of the Catholic Summer School: The Champlain Educator*, Sept., 1904. *Champlain Assembly, Cliff Haven, Programme*, 1909. *Annual Report of the Department of Interior: Commissioner of Education*, Vol. I., 1894-95. pp. 1065-77.

and is doing invaluable work for the diffusion of sound Catholic principles.

In the early days of the colonisation of the United States territory the French and Spanish missionaries made great efforts to spread the Catholic religion among the native Indian tribes. The French missions were confined principally to Maine, New York and Louisiana, while Florida, New Mexico and California were evangelised by the Spanish. The English colonists were not so anxious about either the temporal or spiritual welfare of the tribes. The Jesuit missionaries in Maryland, encouraged by the support of Lord Baltimore, devoted themselves wholeheartedly to the work of reclaiming the Indians in Maryland and the surrounding territory.

As the white immigration into the territories of the Union began to increase after the War of Independence, the position of the natives became particularly difficult. It was proposed by President Monroe, in 1825, that the scattered remains of the Indian tribes should be collected together, and a certain district set aside for their sole use, "where, under the operation of their own laws and institutions, their better qualities might develop themselves." It appears from the report that there were at that time a large number of Indians in the United States. A bill authorising the necessary measures was passed by Congress in 1830. But, unfortunately, difficulties of various kinds arose; the Indians were, naturally, unwilling to accept the settlement; the territories assigned to them were gradually encroached upon, and new Indian reservations had to be formed; wars broke out between the tribes and the government, and it was only in 1880 that the Indian reservations question was settled.

The Jesuits, who had already done good work on the Indian missions, continued in charge, and the second provincial council of Baltimore requested Propaganda to entrust that work exclusively to them. According to the proposals for the erection of reservations, the religious societies engaged in the work of civilising and educating the native tribes should be continued by the

government. The continuance of such a grant to the Indian Catholic schools was bitterly attacked at times, especially during the period when the A. P. A. was strong enough to influence American politics.

A bureau for the work of the Indian missions was established by the archbishop of Baltimore in 1874 on the advice of the bishops in whose dioceses Indian reservations existed. Its duty was to communicate with the government through its commissioner at Washington on all questions affecting such missions. This bureau was approved by the third plenary council of Baltimore (1884) and by the Propaganda. The bureau was dissolved in 1894, and in the same year "The Bureau of Indian Catholic Missions" was incorporated. Its work is to undertake the establishment of boarding schools and common schools among the native tribes, and to secure from the government and from private sources the funds necessary for their maintenance. The council of Baltimore (1884) ordered that a collection should be held throughout the States on Quadragesima Sunday, which should be devoted in great part to helping the societies engaged in instructing the Indians and Negroes.

The position of the negro population in the United States has demanded the attention of both ecclesiastical and civil authorities. In 1787, a society was established in England to found a negro colony in Liberia, to which the slaves who followed the fortunes of England could be transferred. A similar effort was made in America, and a great number of the free negroes chose to settle in the new colony. The second provincial council of Baltimore (1833) requested the Propaganda to ask the Jesuits to take charge of the spiritual wants of the new colony, but apparently the Jesuits did not go, for, in 1840, the Holy See requested the bishops of Philadelphia and New York to send priests from the States into Liberia. Two Irish priests, Fathers Barron (Waterford) and Kelly set out for the new colony in 1841. Father Barron secured some additional help from France and was appointed vicar

apostolic, but, disheartened by the death of several of his companions, he retired after a few years, leaving the colony to the care of the Fathers of the Holy Ghost.

After the Civil War had secured freedom for the large slave population of the Southern States, a new and difficult situation was created. Naturally enough, racial feeling ran high, and the white inhabitants were not then inclined to meet on terms of equality those who had been their menials. In January, 1866, Propaganda sent instructions to the archbishop of Baltimore requesting him to bring the education of the emancipated slaves before the approaching plenary council. The fathers of the council declared that every attention should be paid to the spiritual wants and instruction of the negroes, but hesitated to lay down one common rule as to the best method by which this might be done. If the bishop should think it best to provide separate churches and schools for the negroes he might do so, if he thought that both races might be induced to go to the common church and common school so much the better, but, in any case, the consolations of religion must be equally at the disposal of the negro and of the white. The bishops judged well that missions should be undertaken among the non-Catholic negro population, and issued an appeal for workers in this promising field. The fathers of the third plenary council pointed out that, in conformity with the instructions of Propaganda, and the decrees of 1866, many separate churches and schools had been established for the negroes, while in other districts a place had been provided in the church where they might assist at the religious ceremonies and learn the Christian doctrine. They ordered that churches, schools, and orphanages should be erected for their use, and that priests and students be encouraged to volunteer for work amongst the negro population.

For the purpose of distributing the funds collected annually according to the decree of the third plenary council; for the missions to the negroes, a commission, consisting of the archbishops of Baltimore, Philadelphia,

and New York, has been established. The *Catholic Board for Work among the Colored People* has been incorporated in 1907, and its object is to encourage the Catholics of the States to take more interest in the conversion and welfare of the negro population. A band of secular priests, grouped together under the title of *St. Joseph's Society for Negro Missions,* do good work in many dioceses where the negroes are numerous. According to the statistics of 1909 the Catholic negro population of the United States reached about 300,000.

(*e*) The Labour Question in the States and Later Developments

Claudio Jannet, *Les États Unis Contemporains*, 2 vols., 4e éd., Paris, 1889. Kirkup, *History of Socialism*, London, 1906. Cathrein, *Socialism*, New York, 1904. Hillquit, *History of Socialism in the United States*, New York, 1903. Nitti, *Catholic Socialism*, London, 1908. Ireland, *The Church and Modern Society*, 1898. Elliot, *The Life of Father Hecker*, 2nd ed., New York, 1894; French Translation by Abbé Klein, Paris, 1897. Tardivel, *La Situation Religieuse aux États Unis*, Paris, 1900. T'Serclaes, *Le Pape Léon XIII.*, 3 vols., 1894-1906. Hecker, *The Church and the Age*, New York, 1896. Houtin, *L'Américanisme*, Paris, 1904.

It is natural that the United States, with such a large and increasing industrial population, should not escape the labour difficulties which have proved so embarrassing for the older European nations during the nineteenth century. There are special reasons, too, why one might expect that the division between capital and labour should be exceptionally bitter in the States. The immigration of a large number of individuals who were opposed to the systems existing in their own country, and whose minds were embittered against the ruling classes, tended to spread extreme views amongst the working population; while the large amount of personal liberty and equality guaranteed by the constitution of the States was calculated to promote a longing for the

abolition of social inequality and class distinctions. Besides, the sudden fluctuations in prices, and the appearance during the last thirty years of the gigantic trusts, were calculated to inflict great hardship on the working classes, and by swallowing up the small employers, to destroy the tie of personal interest which is such an important factor in welding together the capitalist and the labourer.

The first Trades Union was founded in the United States in 1845, and since that time the movement has spread rapidly, so that nearly all the skilled labourers are now organised according to their particular trades. These Trades Unions have rendered valuable service to the workmen by affording them some protection against the freaks of employers, by preventing unfair competition and an overcrowding of the particular trades, and by assisting the sick members and the families of deceased members. But, unfortunately, they have not always confined themselves to moderate demands, nor have they been sufficiently on their guard against being led into extreme measures by interested agitators. From 1877 till 1887 a series of organised strikes led to a partial derangement of the industry of the country, the loss of property and of lives, and, while inflicting dreadful suffering on the working classes themselves, did very little to effect a permanent amelioration of their condition.

Besides the societies confined to the members of a particular trade attempts have been made to include the workmen of the United States in one grand organisation. Of such attempts perhaps the most remarkable was the establishment of the Knights of Labour in 1869 by Uriah Stephens, a tailor of Philadelphia. It was founded as a secret society, and succeeded in winning few adherents. But in 1879, Terence Powderly, a Catholic Irishman, was elected to the office of grand master; everything in the oath or ritual of initiation offensive to Catholics was removed; the cloak of secrecy was thrown aside; the aim of the society to organise

labour and to set up an independent political party was proclaimed, and the society spread with amazing rapidity. The Knights were not socialists, nor could their programme be described fairly as socialistic. Nevertheless, many socialists joined the society with the object of securing control and of influencing the policy and programme. Various rumours about the immense membership of the order, and about their aims, coupled with the great strikes on the Missouri Pacific Railway, and at various places throughout the States in 1886, fixed public attention on the Knights of Labour and roused an agitation against them.

The Knights were introduced into Canada by Heilbronner, a Jew, settled in Montreal. The introduction of such a society into a country where labour organisations were hitherto practically unknown, the disturbances which it caused, and the suspicions which hung around its introducer and its methods, brought the society into disrepute amongst Canadian Catholics. Cardinal Taschereau, Archbishop of Quebec, and the bishops of Canada condemned the Knights, and warned Catholics against participation in the order. The condemnation received the approval of Rome (1886).

Such a condemnation in Canada, where the circumstances of the country were so very different, did not necessarily affect the position of the Knights of Labour in the United States, but at the same time, seeing that a large proportion of the Catholic workmen of the States belonged to the society, it was imperative on the bishops to take sides in the dispute. Fortunately, the third plenary council of Baltimore (1884) had provided the machinery for dealing with such a crisis. By one of its decrees it laid down that wherever a society was spread over several dioceses no single bishop could issue a condemnation. Judgment in such a case was to be referred to the board of archbishops, and if they were not unanimous the decision should be referred to the Holy See. A meeting of twelve archbishops was held in October, 1886, and after a full discussion of the rules

and methods of the Knights of Labour in the United States, ten voted against condemnation. Of the whole bishops of the States it was understood that only two or three favoured the condemnation of the order.

In these circumstances Cardinal Gibbons went to Rome in 1887, and presented to the Holy See a memorial in favour of the Knights of Labour. In this he pointed out the objects of the society, namely, (1) the protection of the interests and rights of the working class of the United States, and (2) the removal of the various social evils brought about by the greed, oppression and corruption of the capitalists. He pointed out that many of the Catholics who joined the Knights were loyal to the Church in their refusal to join the freemason body, and the condemnation of the society would have the effect of driving them into secret and illicit combinations. Besides, such a condemnation would be unnecessary, imprudent and injurious, and would serve only to alienate the workingmen from the Church, the bishops and the Holy See. In reply to the charge that the society had encouraged violence and strikes, the cardinal pointed out that strikes were not the invention of the Knights of Labour, but had been resorted to long before the organisation was established, that in movements of this kind, where men's tenderest feelings were aroused, violence was inevitable, but that the Knights, instead of encouraging such action, had made every effort to keep their members within the bounds of legal agitation. The memorial of Cardinal Gibbons, strongly supported as it was by Cardinal Manning, was favourably received in Rome, and the threatened condemnation was averted. The society, however popular at the period, soon lost many of its adherents owing to disputes with other Trades Unions in 1887 and the attempt to capture the organisation made by the Socialists in 1893.

Socialism as such has not made great progress in America. Its leaders and organisers have been foreigners, principally Germans, who were already committed to the socialist programme before their arrival

in the States. Though several attempts had been made to found socialist organisations in the States, yet it was only after the Civil War that anything like a permanent organisation was established. In 1869, after the failure of the Paris *Commune*, a branch of the International Workmen's Association, which was founded to propagate the principles of Karl Marx, was opened in New York. Other societies of the same kind were organised, principally by German immigrants, and in 1877, a convention of the different groups was held at Newark, which resulted in the establishment of the Socialist Labour party of North America. The party aimed principally at capturing the Trades Unions and the Knights of Labour. Divisions soon sprang up amongst the Socialists themselves. Two bodies, the Socialist Trade and Labour Alliance and the Socialist Party, formed at the Indianopolis Convention (1901), claimed the allegiance of the Socialists. The Socialist Party was the stronger, and in the convention held at New York in 1900, and in Chicago in 1904, a policy specially suited to the circumstances of America was agreed upon.

Though the voting power of the Socialist party has been steadily increasing for the past dozen years, it is not likely to prove dangerous in the near future. The different states have adopted measures to improve the conditions of the labouring classes, to protect women and children, to shorten the hours of labour, and to ensure the employees compensation in case of accidents. All facilities are given for the formation of Trades Unions, but the abuses of the powers of such organisations are strenuously guarded against. Permanent boards of arbitration have been established in certain states to which both parties may appeal in cases of dispute, and in particular cases, where strikes affected a large area, as in the miners' strike of 1902, when Bishop Spalding was appointed one of the three commissioners, the government has interfered to insist on arbitration. In its attitude towards the labour problem the Catholic

Church has been extremely prudent. While admitting the grievances of the employees, and showing clearly by the action of the bishops in regard to the Knights of Labour, by the articles in Catholic reviews and newspapers, and by the letters and addresses of the most eminent of the prelates, that Catholic sympathy is on the side of the workingmen, it has endeavoured to keep the programme of the Trades Unions, and the methods within the lines prescribed by Christian morality. Such a position and such a definite policy so strongly in contrast with the wavering and uncertain utterances of the other religious bodies, have aroused the attention of thinking Americans, and have led many to believe that the Catholic Church can alone offer a reasonable solution of the social problem.

Later Developments in the United States

In 1889, the centenary of the foundation of the diocese of Baltimore and of the establishment of the hierarchy in the United States was celebrated in Baltimore. The occasion was availed of to demonstrate the amazing progress of Catholicity in America during the hundred years that had elapsed since Dr. Carroll was appointed bishop. Bishops and priests and laymen were present from all parts of the States, while representatives of the Holy See, of the government, and of many of the countries of Europe, attended to show their sympathy with the proceedings. In connection with the celebration a congress of Catholic laymen was held, in which questions of great interest to Catholics in general, notably the press, religious associations, the schools, and the education of the negroes were discussed. As a fitting close to such a ceremony the Catholic University of America was formally opened.

Soon after a series of events occurred which, by arousing sharp controversies amongst Catholics themselves, were calculated to mar the harmony that had hitherto

existed. The Catholics in the United States were drawn from many nationalities, and, without requiring them to abandon either their national language or their national sympathy, it was obviously for the interests of both Church and State that they should lay aside race jealousy, and unite together as citizens of America. Some people, however, notably the Germans, thought that the interests of religion would be safeguarded best by keeping the nationalities apart, and by providing each with clergy and school teachers of their own race. In proof of the wisdom of this policy they pointed to the great defections amongst the immigrants and the children of immigrants, attributable, according to them, to the want of care in providing the immigrants with teachers, priests and bishops of their own nation. Hence, the committee of the Saint Raphael Society, which was founded in Germany in 1868 to protect the German emigrants, had under discussion, at its annual reunion in Lucerne in 1891, the condition of the German Catholic emigrants in the States, and determined to appeal to the Holy See to provide better for the spiritual wants of the German, Italian, and Austrian communities in America. In a petition forwarded to Rome by the deputy, Cahensly, in 1892 the defections from Catholicity among the immigrants were emphasised, and as a remedy against such an evil it was suggested that the difference in nationality should be taken into account in the establishment of benevolent institutions and schools, and in the appointments to parishes and bishoprics.

Such a scheme, coming from a foreign country, and tending to disrupt the Catholics of America, naturally aroused the strong opposition of the American hierarchy. The future of the Church depended entirely upon its power of adapting itself to the circumstances of the country, and the maintenance of national divisions among the Catholics would have been to aim a blow at the very idea of American unity and nationhood. The bishops sent a strong protest to the Holy See (1892)

against the scheme put forward by Cahensly, and the facts contained in his memorial; and Rome refused to comply with his demands.

In 1892, on the occasion of the celebration of the fourth centenary of the discovery of America, a great Exposition was organised in Chicago. Leo XIII. expressed his anxiety to take part in the celebration, and sent to the Exposition the very map upon which Alexander VI. had traced with his own hand the line of demarcation between the Spanish and Portuguese possessions. The Secretary of State returned a gracious message of thanks, and Cardinal Rampolla in his reply announced that the Pope would send a representative to the celebrations. Mgr. Satolli arrived in America in 1892, and later in the same year, on the establishment of a Papal delegation at Washington, he became the first permanent Papal delegate in the United States. The delegation was purely religious in character, the delegate being supposed to deal with questions which hitherto had been referred to Rome at great expense and loss of time.

Besides the controversies on nationalities and on the public schools another event occurred in 1897 which was calculated to disturb the peace of the Catholic Church in the States. Like the others, too, it had its origin outside rather than inside the American Church. The Catholics in France who were striving for a reconciliation between the Church and the Republic naturally looked to America for inspiration. They saw that there the republican form of government offered every guarantee of liberty to the Catholic Church, while, on the other hand, the Catholic bishops and Catholic clergy were thoroughly loyal to the state and thoroughly American in their outlook. The example of the American Catholics, and the speeches and sermons of some of the American prelates were adduced to prove that Catholicism was not medieval, that it was full of life and vigour, and that it could adapt itself to modern circumstances. The opponents, unable

to deny the fact of the great progress of Catholicity in the American Republic, set themselves rather to question the orthodoxy of the views of some American Catholics, and to show that in the desire to adapt the Catholic religion to the circumstances of the States, a new type of Catholicity, namely, the American type, was being rapidly evolved.

In 1897, when the controversy was already warm, a French translation of the Life of Father Hecker, the founder of the Paulist Fathers, was published in Paris by M. L'Abbé Klein. Father Hecker had been a man of great sanctity and zeal, more dependent for his spiritual guidance upon his own communings with the Holy Spirit than upon the teaching of theologians, and, like his patron, St. Paul, burning with the desire of bringing all men within the fold of Christ. He was strong in inculcating the practice of the virtues most required for American progress, namely, initiative, energy and manliness, and while holding closely by the doctrine of a divinely constituted authority in the Church, he thought that the notions of political liberty current to-day made it advisable to leave individuals more freedom to follow the personal illuminations of the Holy Ghost. He founded the society of the Paulist Fathers principally to give missions to non-Catholics, and before his death in 1888 the society had made considerable progress.

The publication of the French translation of Father Elliot's *Life of Father Hecker* roused a veritable storm of controversy on the Continent. It was contended that the spirit of advanced American Catholicity, of which Father Hecker had been a typical exponent, tended to effect a reconciliation between Christianity and modern thought by abandoning or softening the defined dogmas, and to upset the external teaching authority of the Church in favour of individualism and the internal illumination of the Holy Ghost. In fact, in the excitement of the moment, Americanism became a term by which to designate all the opinions of the Liberal

Catholic school of thought in France, Germany, and Italy. The attack on the French translation, and on the peculiar spirit which it was supposed to embody, was vigorously carried on by Father Coubé, S.J., supported by some of his colleagues, and by M. L'Abbé Maignen, in a series of articles which were afterwards published in book form under the title of "*Le Père Hecker, Est-il un Saint,*" an English translation of which appeared a little later. In these attacks the names of some of the leading bishops of the Catholic Church in the United States were introduced.

The American prelates naturally defended themselves strongly at Rome, and received warm assurances that the orthodoxy of their views on the questions that had been raised had not been doubted, but, at the same time, to put an end to such an ugly controversy, and to state definitely the attitude of the Church on the matters in dispute, Leo XIII. determined to issue the Encyclical "*Testem Benevolentiae,*" which was addressed to Cardinal Gibbons, in January, 1899. The Pope congratulated the American bishops on the great development in the Church in their country, and the correct and able manner in which the prelates had always safeguarded Catholic interests.

But in view of the controversies which had arisen over the *Life of Father Hecker,* and especially over the translation of this book, the Pope pointed out that, however praiseworthy the conversion of non-Catholics, this could not be secured by abandoning a single defined doctrine, and though the discipline of the Church might be changed so as to suit new times and circumstances, such changes could not be introduced by individuals, but by competent authority. Political constitutions might vary from absolutism to the freest republicanism, but such variations could not affect the divinely constituted authority of the Church, nor absolve the individual from due submission. The Holy Ghost, according to Catholic teaching, assists and enlightens the individual, but the Holy Ghost is also guiding the Church to which

the individuals must be subject. Nor can the natural virtues be exalted over the supernatural virtues by anyone who understands the relations of grace and nature, nor can the passive virtues, humility, obedience, and self-denial, of which Christ Himself set such an example, and which He strongly inculcated upon His followers, be neglected in favour of the active virtues, energy, initiative, and self-reliance which are said to be more suited to modern wants. The religious orders have done good work in the Church, and in America as well the orders which devote themselves to the contemplative life, as those which take an active part in the ministry of the gospel, and it would be a mistake to imagine that the religious vows of such orders are out of place in the modern world. Finally, in the work of winning non-Catholics to the Church, it was declared to be dangerous to decry old methods of tried efficacy in favour of something new. Sound preaching of the gospel, the solemnity and splendour of religious worship, and the conformity between the lives of the preachers and the teaching given by St. Paul to Titus and Timothy were the best attractions for non-Catholics; but if some people, in addition, thought that the non-Catholics could be reached more effectively by meeting them in friendly discussions outside the churches they might do so provided always that the bishop sets apart certain priests for such work.

Such is the famous Encyclical on what, as Leo XIII. said, some people called *Americanism*. The American bishops promptly expressed their sincere adhesion to the document, and this all the more readily as they had never held the doctrines that had been condemned. The Paulist Fathers, who had kept aloof from the controversy about their venerated founder, repudiated the teaching that had been disapproved, and withdrew the *Life of Father Hecker* from sale. But they continued their missions to non-Catholics with increased success, and with the blessing of the American episcopate and the Pope (Nov., 1908).

(*f*) The Church in Canada and Newfoundland

The Cambridge Modern History, Vol. XI., pp. 766-78. Turcotte, *Le Canada sous la Union*, 1841-1867, 2 vols., Quebec, 1876. Brasseur de Bourbourg, *Histoire du Canada, de son Église et de ses Missions*, 2 vols., Paris, 1852. *Mandements et Lettres des Évêques de Quebec*, 6 vols., Quebec, 1888-89. *Le Canada ecclésiastique*, Montreal, 1908. *Le Diocèse de Montreal, à la fin du XIX^e Siècle*, Montreal, 1900. *L'Organisation de l'Église au Canada* (*Le Correspondant*, Oct., 1906). Howley, *Ecclesiastical History of Newfoundland*, Boston, 1888. Moran, *The Development of the Catholic Church in Great Britain and the Colonies in the Nineteenth Century* (*Report of First Australian Congress*, pp. 510-55).

The provinces of Canada, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island were ceded to England by France in 1763. The population, exclusive of the natives, was entirely French in its origin, and was settled principally in Southern Canada, with Quebec as the chief town. The total number of French Catholics in the district at the period of the surrender to England was about 70,000. The whole Catholic community was subject to the bishop of Quebec (1674), and owing to the valuable grants of land that had been made to the different communities, the Church at the period possessed considerable financial resources. The three principal religious congregations of men were the Jesuits, the Sulpicians and the Recollects, all of whom had done valuable service in the missions to the Indians, while for the higher education of the girls, the Ursulines and the Sisters of Notre Dame had established several flourishing institutions.

A new period opened for the Catholics when Canada passed under English rule in 1763. By the terms of the convention religious liberty was in some sense secured, but the hostility against the Catholic religion in England was too great to allow such terms to be observed. The government was administered by bigoted officials, and Catholics were carefully excluded from all offices of trust. The see of Quebec was vacant when the city was occupied by the English, and M. Briand, who

was elected by the chapter, had great difficulty before he secured recognition of his authority from the government in London. He was finally recognised not as bishop of Quebec, that title being reserved for a Protestant dignitary, but only as "superintendent of the Roman Church in Canada." The religious congregations of men were forbidden to accept any novices, and, in 1774, the property of the Jesuits and the Recollects was taken over by the state. The English authorities claimed the same rights over the Catholic Church in Canada as they were accustomed to exercise in regard to the English Established Church, and arrogated to themselves the right of approving of the candidates selected for the bishopric, of controlling the appointments of priests, and of superintending the administration of the temporal affairs of the Church. Unfortunately, the bishops of Quebec and their coadjutors, being as a rule men of no great strength of character, were induced to submit to such interference.

Owing to the growing feeling of discontent in the New England States, the government felt it necessary to conciliate the Catholics, and, in 1774, the Act of Quebec was passed, establishing a Legislative Council for the affairs of Canada. It declared that the Roman Catholics of Canada were to enjoy the free exercise of their religion, subject, however, to the supremacy of the king, and could hold their possessions and property with all customary rights and privileges. The property of the religious congregations was excepted from this guarantee. These concessions, though a considerable advance on the security that had been accorded hitherto to the Catholic Church, fell very far short of the terms of the capitulation, and meant much or little according to the will of the governor and of his council. But, such as they were, they were bitterly resented by a section of the English people, and were denounced in violent terms by some of the American colonists.

When the War of Independence began, the Americans invaded Canada in the hope of rousing the Canadians

to throw off the English yoke, but, instead of securing support, they met with a very violent resistance. The Canadians distrusted the colonists who had shown themselves so intolerant of Catholicism, and who had denounced England for recognising the Catholic religion in Canada. Bishop Briand and his clergy took the side of the English, and the deputation, sent to Canada by the colonists, failed to shake their allegiance to the Crown. The loyalty of the Canadian Catholics did not induce the English to grant the Catholic Church full liberty of administration, but it helped to put an end to the active persecution. By the Act of 1791 Canada was divided into two distinct provinces, Upper and Lower Canada. Lower Canada practically belonged to the French, while the Upper province was more or less in the hands of later immigrants.

The Act of 1791 guaranteed the liberties which had been granted the Catholics by the terms of capitulation or by subsequent acts of the government. But in 1794 a Protestant bishop, to whom the authorities had conceded the title of bishop of Quebec, arrived in Canada. The Church of the Recollects was placed at his disposal, and when, in 1796, the monastery of the Recollects was burned the government erected on the grounds a Protestant cathedral and a residence for the bishop. In 1800 the last of the Jesuit Fathers died, and the government took possession of the property of the society in the name of the Crown. The Assembly at Quebec demanded that this property should be applied to Catholic education, but their demands were refused, and part of the money went to the support of the Protestant establishment. The authorities stubbornly refused to permit the erection of new parishes or new churches, although the increase in the population rendered these measures necessary. The unoccupied lands were reserved almost exclusively for Protestant and English settlers, and the Executive Council was largely composed of immigrants, bitterly hostile to the French Canadians. The war between the United States and England in 1812, and the

renewed efforts made by the Americans to secure the support of the Canadians, made it necessary to adopt a more friendly attitude towards the Catholics. Bishop Plessis and his clergy again took the side of the English, and their influence was largely instrumental in detaching Canadian support from the annexation movement. On the conclusion of the war the government rewarded the bishop by recognising his title, bishop of Quebec, and by granting more liberty to the Catholic Church.

In order to put an end to the Catholic strength in Lower Canada a proposal was made that both the Upper and Lower provinces should be united (1823), but such a suggestion was strongly resisted by the French Canadians, who, to the number of 60,000, petitioned against it, and the measure was abandoned. Another subject which aroused a great deal of feeling in Canada at this period was the property of the Sulpicians. By royal grants they had acquired seignorial rights over the district of Montreal, and, as owing to the spread of the city, the land became valuable, an agitation was begun to induce the government to take possession of their property. The Sulpicians offered to abandon their claims in return for an annual grant (1829), but the bishop and clergy protested against such a compromise, and sent a deputation to Rome to solicit the intervention of the Propaganda. This Congregation quashed the proposed agreement, and, in the end, the privy council ratified the ownership vested in the Sulpician congregation. It is from the profits of this property that the Sulpicians have been enabled to do so much for the educational and spiritual wants of Montreal, and of the entire province of Canada.

But the Catholic Church in Canada derives its origin not alone from the French, but also from the unfortunate Catholic emigrants from Ireland and Scotland, who began to flock thither towards the end of the eighteenth century. The great majority of the Irish settlers in the different provinces of Canada were from

the south-eastern counties of Ireland, while the Scotch were the Highland Catholics who were turned out of their holdings by Protestant landlords. These two bodies settled largely in Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, and the entire district of Upper Canada. Edmund Burke, a young priest from the diocese of Kildare, was appointed vicar-general and superior of the missions in Upper Canada. For years he laboured zealously among the Irish and Scotch population in Nova Scotia. He was created bishop in 1818, and died in 1820. In the same year, Alexander MacDonnell was consecrated bishop and took up his residence at Kingston. At the time there were only two priests, one at the Scotch settlement of Glengary, and the other in Toronto, but the number of Catholics soon increased, and in 1826, the diocese of Kingston was created. In 1821, Angus MacEachern was named vicar apostolic of New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Cape Breton, and the Magdalen Islands. The Catholic population of these districts, including Irish, Scotch, Acadians and converted natives, amounted to about 30,000.

The rapid increase of the number of Irish immigrants after 1829 excited the jealousy of some of the French Canadians, who feared that their race might be absorbed by the new settlers; and, hence, in some places, as, for example, in Quebec, the presence of the Irish immigrants was resented even by the religious authorities. For years permission to build a church in Quebec was refused to them, and when at last, in 1833, St. Patrick's Church was built, the archbishop absented himself from the ceremony of dedication.* But, on the other hand, the devotion shown by the French Canadians to the plague-stricken Irish immigrants in the quarantine at Grosse Island, Quebec, Montreal, Kingston, should never be forgotten. The archbishop of Quebec called for volunteers amongst the clergy, and the Irish and Canadian priests made a generous response, seven of

* *Brasseur de Bourbourg*, Vol. II., p. 200.

them paying the penalty with their lives. At Montreal eight of the city priests died at their post in attendance upon the fever-stricken victims of the emigrant ships. Bishop Bourget himself hastened to minister to the sufferers, and caught the terrible disease. The Sisters of Charity, known as the Grey Sisters, the Sisters of Providence, and the Sisters of St. Joseph volunteered to care the sick at the risk of their lives, and numbers of them were stricken down by the fever. In Kingston, Toronto and other parts of Canada the same dreadful scenes were enacted, and in every case the French Canadians vied with one another in their efforts to assist the plague-stricken Irish.*

In the Western and North-Western provinces the Church made considerable progress. In 1818, Abbé Provencher † undertook to evangelise the native tribes in Western Canada, and in 1820, he was consecrated bishop. A few settlers penetrated into the district, and in 1847, Mgr. Provencher was appointed bishop of St. Boniface. In the same year Vancouver was erected into a bishopric, and the missions in these provinces became so numerous that St. Boniface (Manitoba) was raised to the dignity of a metropolitan see. In 1904, a new ecclesiastical province, Victoria, has been created.

The exclusion of all French Canadians from office, and the constant efforts made to make Canada an English Protestant colony led to an insurrection in Canada in 1837. The bishops and the great part of the clergy were opposed to the insurgents, but their efforts could not prevent a large section of the population joining in the movement, which from the beginning was doomed to failure. The report of Lord Durham, however, opened the eyes of the English authorities to the abuses existing in Canada, and to the necessity for applying a remedy. The two provinces of Upper and Lower Canada were united in 1840, but the guarantees for the liberty of the Catholic Church were confirmed and ex-

* Maguire, *The Irish in America,* Chap. VIII.

† Dugas, *Mgr. Provencher et les Missions de la Rivière Rouge,* Montreal, 1889.

tended, and the claims of royal supremacy were finally abandoned. The governors of Canada, who formerly appointed to all offices of state, were reduced to the same condition as is the king in the English constitution, and the Legislative Assembly became the real controller of Canadian affairs. By a royal edict published in 1851 it was declared that the free exercise of religion was guaranteed to all her majesty's subjects in the Dominion.

The period of peace was availed of by the bishops to strengthen and develop the ecclesiastical organisation. New sees were created in the different parts of Canada inhabited by the French or the Irish and Scotch immigrants. The need of provincial councils to unify the customs and discipline of the different portions was felt both in Rome and in Canada. In 1851, the first provincial council of Quebec was held. This was followed by others, held in the same city in 1854, 1863, and 1868. In 1857, a provincial council was held in Halifax, which had been raised to the dignity of a metropolitan see in 1852.* These provincial councils served to give the Church in Canada a code of legislation suited to its requirements, and by bringing the bishops together for consultation helped to put an end to the French Canadian spirit of subserviency, which had been so dangerous for the Church during the early years of English domination. Though the bishops of Canada assemble yearly for the discussion of ecclesiastical affairs, yet for many years various difficulties prevented the convocation of a plenary council, but, at their annual meeting in April, 1909, it was determined to convoke a plenary council, which met in Quebec in September, 1909.

The Catholic population of Canada increased rapidly during the nineteenth century. The influx of Irish and Scotch Catholic immigrants, especially in the maritime provinces, helps to account for the Catholic progress which is largely out of proportion to the entire increase of population; but, on the other hand, it should be re-

* *Collectio Lacensis*, Vol. III.

membered that great numbers of French Canadians have emigrated to the United States in recent years, and have helped to turn the scales in favour of Catholicity in the New England States. The Canadian clergy are, however, opposed to the emigration of their people, and in order to retain them at home have undertaken very successful schemes of colonisation in the Western and North-Western territory of the Dominion. The entire Catholic population of Canada, which includes New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and the entire English possessions in North America except Newfoundland, is about 2,400,000. This population is divided over eight ecclesiastical provinces, and the entire number of archiepiscopal and episcopal sees is twenty-eight, together with three vicariates apostolic. The Irish and Scotch Catholics are strongly represented in the provinces of Halifax, Toronto, and Kingston, while Montreal, Ottawa, and Quebec are almost entirely in the hands of the French Canadians. The total number of secular priests engaged on the Canadian mission is about three thousand five hundred. In recent times an Apostolic delegate has been appointed with his residence at Ottawa.

As in other countries, the question of education has given rise to prolonged struggles in Canada.* In the British North American Act of 1867, by which the present federal constitution was established, it was stipulated that any educational rights enjoyed by a minority in the provinces before the federal union should be maintained. Hence, in Quebec, where the Catholics were in the majority, and in Ontario, where the Protestants had the majority, the denominational schools were safe. They had been in existence and had been recognised long before 1867. In these two provinces the Catholic schools are under the control of a board consisting of the bishops of the province and an equal number of Catholic laymen. A similar board controls

* Stockley, *The Canadian North-West School Question: American Catholic Quarterly*, 1905, pp. 472-94.

the Protestant schools, and the united committees form the Council of Public Instruction. The schools are maintained out of public taxes. The first place where a difficulty arose was in the province of New Brunswick, where, before 1867, the establishment of denominational schools for the minority was duly recognised. But in 1871, the provincial government of New Brunswick abolished this privilege, and the neutral schools were to be the general rule. The Catholics resented this attack upon their schools as a breach of the constitution of 1867, and appealed for relief to the federal Parliament. But their appeal met with little success, and nothing remained for the Catholics except to offer a stubborn resistance to the new legislation. The bishops took the liberty of advising their flocks to refuse to pay the school rates, and their advice was accepted with enthusiasm. The situation became so serious that the government was forced to propose a compromise (1874), which in practice, though not in theory, left the Catholics their separate schools, conducted in great part by members of religious congregations.

It was in reference to the province of Manitoba, however, that the educational struggle reached its highest point. When Manitoba entered the federal union in 1870, it was stipulated that if separate schools existed by law or practice these should be continued. But in 1890, the Protestant majority in the Legislature of Manitoba abolished the denominational schools in spite of the protests of the bishops of the province, and nothing remained but to appeal to the Governor of Canada and to the Privy Council in London. The Governor ordered the Legislature of Manitoba to introduce such amendments as would meet the wishes of the Catholics, but the authorities of Manitoba refused to accept such advice. Finally, in 1891, the Conservatives introduced a bill into the federal Parliament restoring the position of the Catholic schools in Manitoba, but it was opposed by Laurier and the Liberal party on the ground that the federal Parliament could not force the Legislature to

comply, that even though the measure became law the Legislature of Manitoba could refuse to vote the necessary funds, and, finally, that the interests of all parties could be consulted best by a friendly compromise. The federal Parliament was dissolved, and in the elections of 1896 the School Question in Manitoba was the principal issue submitted to the electors. As a result, the Liberal party under Laurier was returned with a large majority, and a compromise on the School Question was proposed to and accepted by the authorities of Manitoba (1896).

According to this Laurier compromise, it was agreed that in all schools where a certain percentage of the parents demanded religious instruction for their children full facilities must be given to the clergy to give such instruction in the schools outside the hours set apart for secular education. Furthermore, where a certain number of Catholic parents demanded a Catholic teacher the Board of Education must satisfy their wishes. By this convention Laurier hoped to settle a dispute which had already aroused the greatest feeling throughout Canada, but the Catholics objected to the terms as implying a total abandonment of their claims to separate education, and the bishops refused to accept the compromise. In these circumstances the Catholic Liberal members of Parliament, who had been instrumental in bringing about the compromise, appealed to Rome, and requested the Pope to send a special delegate to Canada to study the whole question.

Leo XIII. sent Mgr. Merry del Val, at present Cardinal Secretary of State, as his delegate to Canada. The delegate interviewed all parties, and succeeded in securing additional concessions for the Catholics. It was agreed that the Catholic children should be allowed to group themselves in such a way that in practice most of their schools would be almost entirely Catholic. Besides, the archbishop of St. Boniface was to be a member of the Education Board, the text-books were to be revised so as to cut out everything objectionable to Catholics, a fair proportion of Catholic inspectors were to be

appointed, and facilities were to be given to the members of religious congregations to obtain the necessary diplomas. The Papal delegate reported that the repeal of the objectionable school law in Manitoba was impossible, that the continuation of the controversy would only lead to a religious war throughout Canada, and that, in the circumstances, the best course would be to accept the concessions that were offered. By the Encyclical, *Affari vos* (8th Dec., 1897), the Pope approved of the decision of his delegate, and, while protesting against the injustice done to the Catholic schools, advised the bishops to make the best of the law as amended. The Catholics adopted the Pope's advice, and the controversy was closed in Manitoba.*

But it was soon to open again in the North-West provinces. By a law passed in 1875 it was agreed that the minority of ratepayers, whether Protestant or Catholic, might establish separate schools, and in case they did so, their share of the school rate was to go to the support of their own schools. Some changes had been introduced since that date, but in 1905, when the Autonomy Bill for the formation of the North-West provinces was introduced, the rule still held good that Catholics paid their taxes only for the support of schools frequented by Catholics, and staffed with exclusively Catholic teachers. The Prime Minister, Sir Wilfred Laurier, taking his stand on the terms of the constitution of 1867, insisted that a clause should be inserted safeguarding the position of the Catholic schools. A great agitation was begun in favour of the undenominational schools, but the Prime Minister stood firm, and in the North-West provinces the separate schools were saved.

The religious congregations of both sexes are well represented in Canada. The Sulpicians, though not the oldest body, are perhaps the most closely identified with the Canadian Church on account of their educational establishments. The Jesuits returned to Canada in

* T'Serclaes, *Le Pape, Léon XIII.*, Vol. III., pp. 325-27.

1842, and have opened houses in different parts of the country. In recompense for their property that had been confiscated a sum of £80,000 was paid to them in 1889. The Oblates of Mary Immaculate, the Dominicans, the Fathers of the Holy Cross, the Franciscans, the Trappists, &c., have communities in many of the leading centres. The Brothers of the Christian Schools, the Brothers of the Sacred Heart, the Marist Brothers, and the Brothers of St. Gabriel, do good work in the primary schools, especially in Lower Canada. The principal congregations of nuns are the Sisters of Notre Dame, of Holy Cross, of the Sacred Heart, of Charity, and of Providence. Many of the leading secondary schools are conducted by the religious congregations, and the entire secondary education is in the hands of clergy, secular or regular.

For the university education of Catholics there exists the University of Laval at Quebec and Montreal. The University of Laval at Quebec was established in 1852, by virtue of a royal charter. It consists of four faculties, theology, medicine, law and arts. It can confer all degrees, and enjoys all the privileges accorded to universities in Canada. A branch of the University of Laval exists also at Montreal, with faculties of theology, medicine, law, and arts. A polytechnic school also exists at Montreal, supported by the state, and in connection with the university. The university is supported by private subscriptions, fees, and a small state endowment. The number of students at Quebec is about 200, and in Montreal about 560. A university has been established at Ottawa by the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, and is supported entirely from private sources. In New Brunswick the provincial university is open to all, and a Catholic College is affiliated with this body. For Nova Scotia two Catholic colleges, St. Francis Xavier's at Antigonish, and St. Anne's in Digby, have university charters, and St. Anne's is in receipt of a small local government endowment. The province of Manitoba has the University of Manitoba, which is only an examin-

ing body, and with it are affiliated colleges for Catholics, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and Methodists. Each of these bodies elect seven representatives to the university senate, and the affiliated colleges are autonomous.*

For the education of the clerical students there exist theological seminaries at Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, and Halifax. Quebec seminary was founded by Bishop Laval, and Montreal by the Sulpicians in 1840. These two form the theological faculty of Laval University, and have the power of granting degrees since 1876. Montreal is frequented by large numbers of students, not alone from Canada but from several dioceses in the United States. The Sulpicians have, besides, a college for Canadian students in Rome. The seminary at Ottawa is conducted by the Oblates, and the seminary at Halifax by the Eudist Fathers.

Newfoundland.—Newfoundland was finally ceded to England by France in 1763. At that time there was a small Catholic population, amounting to about 4,800, composed mostly of Irish emigrants from Waterford and Wexford, who were attracted thither by the famous Newfoundland fisheries. Once the British took possession of the colony all the laws in force in England against Catholics were applied with merciless rigour by the governors of Newfoundland. Priests were forbidden to remain in the colony, houses in which it was reported that Mass had been said were burned, Catholics were excluded from all positions under the Crown, and the lands that had been acquired by them were to be confiscated. But these measures did not succeed in retarding the growth of the Catholic population, or in preventing Irish priests from ministering to their people.

Owing to the dangerous position of affairs in the former American colonies the authorities were obliged to abandon the religious persecution, and to proclaim the free exercise of all forms of religious worship (1784).

* *Papers Relating to University Education of Roman Catholics in certain Colonies, Parliamentary Report*, 1900.

At that time, out of a total population of 20,000, the Catholics were reckoned as 8,000. In the same year Father O'Donnell, an Irish Franciscan, was appointed prefect apostolic of Newfoundland. On his arrival in the island he set about erecting suitable houses of worship, but at every step he was opposed by the civil authorities, and it was only when the authority of the prefect was needed to prevent a rebellion that his services began to be appreciated. The difficulty of communicating with Ireland, and of obtaining the holy oils from Dublin, made it advisable that the prefect apostolic of Newfoundland should receive episcopal consecration. A petition to that effect was forwarded to Rome in 1794, and was favourably received. In 1796, Dr. O'Donnell was consecrated in the cathedral of Quebec. It is interesting to note that at this period the Irish colony in Newfoundland used the Irish language, and that the prefect apostolic felt it necessary to appeal to the archbishop of Dublin to send Irish-speaking priests. On the resignation of Dr. O'Donnell in 1807 an Irish Franciscan, named Lambert, was appointed to succeed him. Under the rule of the Irish Franciscans, Lambert, Scallan, and Fleming, the Church in Newfoundland made great progress. Religious congregations of women were brought from Ireland to take charge of the educational and charitable institutions, and the foundations of the beautiful cathedral of St. John's were laid (1841). The cut stone used in the building was brought from Ireland, and a great share of the building done by masons brought specially from the same country.

In 1847, St. John's was erected into an episcopal see, and since that time it has become necessary to erect several additional bishoprics. At present St. John's is a metropolitan church, with two suffragan dioceses, Harbour Grace and St. George's, and a prefecture apostolic. There are in Newfoundland 75,989 Catholics, as against 73,008 belonging to the Church of England, and 61,388 Methodists.

(*g*) The Church in Central and Southern America

Deberle, *Histoire de l'Amérique du Sud*, Paris, 1897. Beltrán y Rózpide, *Los Pueblos Hispanoamericanos en el Siglo XX.*, Madrid, 1902. Eyzaguirre, *Los intereses católicos en América*, 2 vols., Paris, 1859. Hernaer, *Colección de bulas, breves, y otros documentos relativos á la Iglesia de América*, Paris, 1866. *Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Americae Latinae in Urbe celebrati*, 1899, 2 vols., Rome, 1900. Giobbio, *Lezioni di Diplomazia Ecclesiastica*, 2 vols., Rome, 1899-1901. Girón y Arcas, *La situación juridica de la Iglesia, en los diversos estados de Europa y de América*, Madrid, 1905.

Mexico.—From the sixteenth century, when Cortes reduced the inhabitants to subjection,* Mexico was a Spanish colony, ruled by viceroys sent from Spain. But the revolution effected in the northern portions of the American Continent, the rebellion of the colonies against England, and the establishment of the independent republic of the United States exercised a great influence on the subsequent developments in the Spanish and Portuguese colonies. The success of the French Revolution, and the spread of revolutionary ideas by means of the secret societies, especially by the freemasons, prepared the way for a rebellion. The disordered condition of affairs in Spain, and the mutiny of the army that was brought together to quell the rebellion, delivered Mexico into the hands of the rebels. In 1821, the last Spanish viceroy surrendered the capital to the rebel forces. In 1822, General Itúrbide was proclaimed Emperor, but in a few months he was obliged to abdicate. In 1824, the republican form of government was proclaimed. From 1824 till 1876 the history of Mexico is one long record of civil war and rebellion. Since the foundation of the republic, fifty-five rulers, including presidents, dictators, an emperor, and a regent, have tried their hands at governing Mexico, but their tenure of office (except Diaz, elected 1877) has been short, and many of them have been violently deposed.

* Alamán, *Historia de México*, 5 vols., Mexico, 1849-50.

The revolutionary party in the early years of the Mexican Republic was violently opposed to the Catholic Church. As in other countries, the war was directed against the altar as well as against the throne, but in Mexico the anti-religious feeling was more violent than elsewhere on account of the overwhelming strength of the freemason lodges, which practically dominated the country. Besides, the Republican party itself was divided into two great sections, the Federalists and the Centralists who for years continued to struggle against each other for the supreme power in the country. The bishops and higher clergy were on the side of the Centralists, and as a result no persecution against the Church was too severe to be undertaken by the Federalists. As in Spain and Portugal, the identification of the Catholic Church with the interests of one party during a long period of civil strife has been at the root of many of the misfortunes of the Catholic religion in Mexico.

In 1824, when the republican constitution was proclaimed, the Catholic religion was declared to be the state religion, and the only one that would be tolerated in Mexico. This was done in order to please the vast majority of the people, and to secure the recognition of the new republic by the Pope. On the other hand, Spain threatened to break off relations with the Pope if he recognised the rebellious colony, or if he attempted to infringe the rights of Spain by appointing to vacant bishoprics in Mexico. Leo XII. took up a very friendly attitude to the new Republic (1825), but the Federalists rejected his interference, and showed themselves opposed to entering into any convention with Rome. In consequence of this the bishoprics were vacant, the whole ecclesiastical organisation was disarranged, and the peasantry loudly expressed their dissatisfaction with such an anti-Catholic policy. Negotiations were then opened with Gregory XVI., and a convention was agreed to (16th May, 1831), according to which the vacant sees could be filled. But this convention was badly received both by Spain and by the more Radical party in

Mexico. Under the presidency of Santa Anna a violent anti-Catholic policy was pursued. The religious orders were suppressed, the property of the Church confiscated, and all communications with the Holy See were broken off. The next president, Herrera, set himself to repair the injuries that had been inflicted upon the ecclesiastical organisation by his predecessor, and to re-establish diplomatic relations with the Holy See. A Papal nuncio was despatched to Mexico in 1851, and negotiations were begun for the arrangement of a concordat (1852), but a new revolution took place before the concordat could be concluded, and a new era of persecution opened for the Catholic Church. The bishops were banished from the kingdom, the property of the Church confiscated, the religious orders banished or imprisoned, and civil marriage introduced (1858). In that year Juárez, the leader of the Radical anti-Catholic section, became president, but he was opposed by General Miramon, as the representative of the Conservative element. The civil war was waged with great bitterness, and in 1861 Juárez took possession of the capital. He refused to pay the foreign debts that had been incurred by his predecessors, and France, England and Spain were obliged to land forces in Mexico in order to make good their claims.

Napoleon III. was resolved to utilise the expedition in order to establish an empire in Mexico under the rule of the Archduke Maximilian, brother of the Emperor of Austria. The English and Spanish forces were withdrawn, and the French declared war upon the government of Juárez. The city of Mexico was taken in 1863, and most of the Conservatives and Catholics rallied to the support of the Archduke. Messengers were despatched to offer him the throne of Mexico in the name of the Mexican people, and in 1864 he arrived. He was welcomed by the Catholic people, who hoped to find in him a saviour, but Maximilian, in order to win over the Liberal leaders still hostile to him, continued the persecution of the Church. The laws made by Juárez were

retained in force; religion was banished from the schools; the *Placet* on ecclesiastical documents was introduced, and the Papal nuncio, who ventured to remonstrate, was sent out of the country. As a result, Maximilian lost the sympathy of the Conservatives without securing the support of the Liberals. He was dependent entirely upon French soldiers, and when Napoleon III. withdrew these at the request of the United States, the Liberals under Juárez advanced against Maximilian. The latter strove to rally the Conservative party by promises of reform, but his forces were outnumbered, and he himself was betrayed into the hands of the Liberals. He was tried by court-martial, and executed (19th July, 1867).

On the return of Juárez to power he determined to wreak full vengeance on the Catholic Church, a great body of the clergy of which had supported the ill-fated Maximilian. Hence, having duly prepared his plans, he secured the passage of a measure for the complete separation of Church and State (1874). According to the terms of this bill, Church and State were mutually independent, but the State reserved for itself control over religion as far as it regarded public order, or was assisted by public institutions. The civil authorities were to take no official part for the future in the particular ceremonies of any religious body, nor was the religious observance of holidays any longer obligatory. Religious functions were to be performed only inside the churches, and any infraction of this law was to be punished with fine or imprisonment. Clergymen of all denominations were to be treated in the eyes of the law as other citizens, and if, in the exercise of their office, they recommended disobedience to the laws of the state or the commission of any crime, they were to be punished severely. The churches were to be handed over for religious worship, while the religious body could organise itself according to its own rules, and the head of the society would be treated as such by the state. These religious societies could not acquire property except

what was necessary for religious worship. They could accept charitable assistance, but not legacies; and collections for religious purposes were forbidden except inside the churches.

By the same law all religious teaching and all religious practices were prohibited in the schools and in the civil institutions. The religious orders or congregations were suppressed, the religious oath was abolished, the cemeteries were taken from the control of the Church, civil marriage was decreed, all promises or vows restrictive of individual liberty were forbidden, and all gifts or legacies made by a testator to the clergyman who attended him spiritually were declared void.

Juárez and the Liberal party were confident that by the Law of Separation conceived in such terms they had effectively destroyed the influence of the Catholic Church in Mexico, but results have shown that in reality the Separation Law has proved a benefit to religion. It has given the ecclesiastical authorities a fair share of liberty in the performance of their functions, and, especially, it has given the Pope a free hand in the selection of the bishops. The seminaries for the education of the clergy are placed under the control of the bishops; the priests are no longer dependent upon the republic for support, but receive a more generous treatment in the free gifts of the people. The success of the Church in Mexico, and the revival that has been witnessed during the last twenty years, are due in great measure to the comparative peace which the country has enjoyed since the election of Díaz to the presidency in 1877. He has held office for thirty-two years, and, though forced by the terms of the Separation Law to come into conflict with the Church, it must be admitted that he has endeavoured to be as fair to the Church as the constitution allowed. The clauses against religious orders have not been strictly enforced, and many of the other harassing petty enactments have been dropped in view of public opinion on these questions. The bishops of Mexico have shown great activity in recent years, and their action

has been reflected in the conduct of the Catholic body. Catholic societies have been established; free schools, both primary and secondary, have been opened in face of the government neutral schools; the seminaries have been remodelled, and several sound Catholic newspapers have been established. Out of a total population of 13,605,919 (1900), 12,380,240 were Catholics, 40,445 Protestants, 8,972 Jews, and the remainder were of no religion. There are eight archbishoprics and twenty-two bishoprics in the republic. Since 1905 diplomatic relations with the Holy See have been re-opened, and a Papal delegate has been despatched to Mexico.*

GUATEMALA.—Guatemala had, according to the Census of 1903, a population of 1,842,134, 60 per cent. of whom were pure Indians, and the majority of the others half-caste, there being few pure Europeans among the resident population. Nearly all these belong, at least in name, to the Catholic Church. In 1821, when Mexico proclaimed its independence, Guatemala proposed that the other states of Central America should unite under the rule of Itúrbide, but the others refused such a union. On the downfall of Itúrbide, the states of Central America formed an independent Confederation (1824), but this union was broken up in 1839, when Carrera (1839-1865) captured the supreme power in Guatemala. Since that time Guatemala has been a republic, and so late as 1885 its president made a new effort to effect a confederation of the Central American states so as to counterbalance the strength of the United States.

The revolution in Guatemala against the Spanish rule was headed by men who were hostile to the Catholic Church, and, as a result, the clergy were persecuted, especially the religious orders, and the ecclesiastical property was confiscated. Negotiations were opened up with Pius IX. for the conclusion of a concordat, and in 1853 a concordat, consisting of twenty-eight articles, was

* Knöpfler-Villaescusa, *Manual de Historia Eccl.*, Freiburg, 1908, pp. 626-7

agreed to by the plenipotentiaries of both parties.* According to the first article of this convention the Catholic religion was proclaimed to be the religion of the state, and it was guaranteed the possession of all the rights and prerogatives accorded to it by divine or canon law. The method of appointing bishops, canons, and parish priests, and the freedom of the religious congregations were also arranged. But the terms of the concordat were not long observed. On the election of General Barrios to the Presidency in 1871 a new persecution of the Church began. The Jesuits were suppressed in 1872, a few months later the Oratorians met the same fate, and finally, before the end of the year, all the religious congregations of men were entirely suppressed. Their property was handed over to the state, and those of the religious who did not wish to be secularised were sent to reside in one common establishment. Even this house was eventually closed. The religious congregations of women were forbidden to receive novices. But, in practice, these decrees have not been strictly enforced. About the same time (1874) the seminary which was attached to the Jesuit college was closed, and the buildings handed over to the government. It was necessary, then, to organise a new seminary, and to support it by private endowments. By the new constitution of 1879 equal protection was accorded to all forms of religious worship so long as they were exercised within the religious houses, and were not subversive of the public peace. The concordat, though repeatedly violated, has never been formally denounced, and its provisions in regard to the appointment to benefices are still enforced by the civil authorities. The archbishop of Guatemala is the metropolitan for the states of Central America.

Honduras.—Honduras imitated the example set by Mexico, and rose in revolt against Spain. In 1824 it joined the Confederation of the states of Central America, but in 1839, it separated from the Confedera-

* Nussi, *Conventiones*, XL.

tion, and became a separate republic. It had in 1905 a population of 500,136, the greater part of whom were Indians or half-castes. Of the few pure Europeans resident in Honduras the majority belong to Spain. The Catholic Church suffered the same fate during the revolution in Honduras as in other countries. In order to settle the ecclesiastical affairs of the country negotiations were finally opened up with Pius IX., and in 1861, a concordat * was concluded, by which the Catholic religion was recognised as the state religion, with all its rights and privileges guaranteed. But the terms of the convention were not long regarded as binding by the government. In the constitution drawn up in 1880 the state reserved to itself the right of inspection over all forms of worship, and in the constitution of 1894 the free exercise of religious worship is secured, provided only that it does not offend morality or public order. By another clause of the constitution (Art. 58) the establishment of all classes of monastic associations is prohibited. This law, however, is not strictly enforced in practice. The seminary was suppressed in 1887; the education in the primary schools is lay and obligatory; and the secondary schools are for the most part in the hands of the state authorities.

Salvador.—Like the other provinces of Central America, Salvador revolted against Spanish rule in 1821, and became a member of the Central American Confederation in 1824. In 1838, it became an independent republic, and continues to maintain the same form of government till the present day. The total population in 1901 amounted to 1,006,848, most of whom are a mixed race or pure Indians. Of this population about 1,000,000 are Catholics. In 1862, a concordat was concluded with the Holy See, by which the appointments to the bishopric and to parishes, and the position of the religious congregations were regulated. This concordat has been observed in most of its particulars, though

* Nussi, *Conventiones*, XLVII.

according to the constitution of 1880 religious congregations were strictly prohibited, but this regulation has not been enforced. By the constitution of 1888 the Catholic religion was recognised as the state religion. For the Catholic population of Salvador there are a bishop resident at San Salvador, a cathedral chapter, about one hundred priests, two lyceums for the education of boys, and three for girls.

NICARAGUA.—Nicaragua is a state with a population of about 600,000 (1906). The vast majority of these are of a mixed race, and a large percentage of the population consists of Indians who are completely uncivilised. Practically the entire population belongs to the Catholic Church. Nicaragua declared itself independent of Spain (1821), joined the Central American Confederation in 1824, and established itself as an independent republic in 1838. Since that time the career of the little republic has been a troubled one. It has been involved in war with Costa Rica, Guatemala, and England, while at home the radical and conservative parties disputed the supreme power by force of arms. During the revolution and the turmoil of civil war the Catholic Church suffered severely. According to the constitution of 1858 the Catholic religion was proclaimed the religion of the state, and was secured in the possession of all its rights and privileges. Four years later (1862) a concordat was concluded with the Holy See, by which the ecclesiastical organisation was again completed, but the terms of the concordat were soon violated by the dominant faction in Nicaragua. Under the presidency of García Granados (1871) liberty of worship was proclaimed, the ecclesiastical property was confiscated, and even the public use of the ecclesiastical dress was forbidden. By the law of 1893 religious vows, at least as regards contemplative religious orders, were forbidden, and religion was banished from the public schools. But these laws have not been always strictly administered. For the immense Catholic population of Nicaragua there are a bishop, resi-

dent at the capital, about forty-five priests, one seminary, and a number of schools for girls and boys, conducted for the most part by religious congregations.

Costa Rica.—Costa Rica proclaimed its independence in 1821, and a provisional government was established. From 1824 till 1838 it remained a member of the Central American Confederation, and on the break up of that body Costa Rica became an independent republic. From 1838 till 1870, when the present constitution was accepted, the history of Costa Rica presents only one long struggle between rival leaders for the supreme control. Since 1883 the government of the state has been stable, and serious efforts have been made to develop the resources of the country. The population, including the unreclaimed native inhabitants, amounted in 1906 to about 345,090, practically the whole of whom are set down as Catholics.

During the years of turmoil and revolutions the Church in Costa Rica suffered the same fate as in the other states of Central America. But in 1852, a concordat was concluded with Pius IX., by which the ecclesiastical affairs of the country were regulated, and the privileges claimed by the Spanish rulers passed into the hands of the independent government. The constitution of 1870 proclaimed the Catholic religion the religion of the state, but liberty was conceded for the exercise of other forms of religious worship, provided that they did not offend against public order or decency. The Catholic religion was to be taught in all public schools in the kingdom. But at times hostility towards the Church has been manifested in government circles. By a law passed in 1894 missions, whether given by regular or secular priests, were prohibited, and all religious congregations, not devoted to works of charity, were declared to be illegal. The clergy are supported by the state. For the Catholic population there is a bishop resident in the capital, San José, about one hundred secular priests, assisted by a few regulars, a

seminary conducted by the Lazarist fathers, and colleges for boys and girls under the control of religious congregations. In 1908, Pius X. sent an Apostolic delegate to reside in Costa Rica, and to act as extraordinary envoy to the government of the republic.

Panama.—Panama was only a department in the Republic of Colombia till 1903, when it proclaimed its independence. Its independence was recognised immediately by the United States, which has large interests in the district owing to the construction of the Panama Canal; and the example of the United States was followed by the other nations. The total population of the new republic is about 400,000, composed of all kinds of races. The new constitution proclaimed liberty of worship and pure secularism in education. The vast bulk of the population is Catholic, and is subject to the bishop of Panama.

Cuba.—Cuba * remained subject to Spanish rule during the greater portion of the nineteenth century. It was ruled by governors sent from Madrid, but owing to the difference of treatment accorded to the Spaniards and the native population, Cuba was the scene of frequent conspiracies and revolutions. In 1895, a formidable revolution, which the Spaniards were unable to repress, broke out in Cuba. The United States of America had good reasons for interesting themselves in the welfare of Cuba, especially as there was danger that some of the European nations might conclude a bargain with Spain, and attempt to take over possession of the island. Hence, it was not difficult to provoke a war between the United States and Spain (1898). Cuba was occupied by troops from the United States, and in December, 1898, Spain was obliged to abandon all claims to the island. In 1901, a free Cuban constitution † was proclaimed, and the American forces were withdrawn. But in 1906,

* Pezuela, *Historia de la Isla de Cuba*, 4 vols., Madrid, 1868-78.
† *Constitución de la República de Cuba*, Havana, 1901.

owing to disputes between the Conservative and Liberal parties, and the outbreak of a new civil war, the United States government was again obliged to intervene, and to undertake the temporary management of Cuban affairs.

The total population of Cuba in 1899 was 1,572,845, most of whom were Catholics. According to the new constitution all religions are free, and the exercise of all forms of religious worship is permitted, provided that proper respect is shown to Christian morality and public order. No religion is to be recognised as established, and no religion is to receive any grants or assistance from the state. The question of the ecclesiastical property in Cuba caused serious difficulties after the occupation of the island by the United States. In 1841, the Governor of Cuba seized a large share of the ecclesiastical property belonging to the religious congregations and appropriated it to the use of the state. Besides, the government took possession of the mortgages and grants of property that had been made for religious purposes, and in return for all this paid to the ecclesiastical authorities a large sum annually for the maintenance of religion and of religious establishments. When, therefore, it was decided that the new state should give no financial assistance to any religion it became necessary to give some compensation to the Church for the large annual grant to which she was entitled in strict justice. To arrange this complicated subject a judicial commission was appointed in 1902. Its work was to value the property and the mortgages that had been seized, and to award sufficient compensation. The decision of this commission appears to have been sufficiently satisfactory, and secured for the Church a large capital sum to be expended on the maintenance of religion.

For the ecclesiastical government of Cuba there is an Apostolic delegate resident at Havana. The island is divided into one archdiocese, Santiago de Cuba, and three suffragan dioceses, Havana, Cienfuegos (established 1903), and Pinar del Rio (1903). There is a fair

supply of priests, both secular and regular. In all the dioceses, but more especially in Santiago and Havana, there are flourishing colleges for boys and girls, conducted for the most part by members of religious congregations. There can be very little doubt but that the establishment of a stable government, under the protection of the United States, will, by securing a period of peace, have a great influence for good on the Catholic Church in Cuba.

Haiti and San Domingo.—The island of Haiti was discovered by Columbus in 1492, and remained subject to Spain till the treaty of Ryswick (1697), when Charles II. of Spain ceded the eastern portion of the island to France. In 1791, a terrible revolution broke out in the island. The blacks and the mulattoes rose in revolt, and after a frightful struggle the white race was almost completely extirpated. In 1795, Spain ceded all her rights over the western portion of the island to France, so that the whole island became subject to French rule. France made desperate efforts (1801-03) to reduce the inhabitants to submission, but failed, and in 1804, Dessalines proclaimed himself emperor of Haiti. In 1808, the eastern portion of the island, San Domingo, rebelled against Haiti, and associated itself to Spain. Later on, it rebelled against Spain, and became subject once more to Haiti till 1844. Finally, in 1864, the island was definitely divided into two independent republics, Haiti and San Domingo.

The history of Haiti during the nineteenth century has been one long record of civil strife and revolutions. The population amounts to about 1,500,000, nine-tenths of which is composed of negroes, descendants of the imported slaves, and the vast bulk of the remainder are mulattoes. Practically the entire population belongs to the Catholic Church. In 1886, a concordat was concluded with the Holy See, by which the ecclesiastical affairs of the republic were arranged. The Catholic religion is recognised as the religion of the state in the

constitution of 1889, and provision is made for the maintenance of the clergy and of religious worship. In 1904, the Chambers voted the sum of £90,000 for the erection of two Catholic cathedrals, one at Port-au-Prince and the other at Cape Haiti. The republic is divided into one archdiocese and four suffragan bishoprics. The religious congregations of both sexes have charge of a great number of colleges and schools.

The Republic of San Domingo was finally established after the revolution of 1864, when the last of the Spanish troops were expelled. It has a population of over 400,000, who are mainly a mixed race. The people are almost entirely Catholic, and, according to the constitution, the Catholic religion is the religion of the state, and entitled to support, though liberty of worship is conceded to other religious bodies. The archbishop of San Domingo has ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the Catholic population of the republic. He is assisted by about sixty secular priests and a few of the regular clergy. There are a seminary and a large number of purely Catholic schools. The republic maintains an ambassador at the Vatican.

COLOMBIA.—In 1810, Colombia* rose in rebellion against Spain. A provisional government was proclaimed, and the Republic of the United Provinces of New Granada established. These provinces embraced the modern Colombia, Panama, Ecuador, and Venezuela. On the re-establishment of settled government in Spain prolonged efforts were made to reduce the rebellious colonies, but without success, and Spain was obliged to abandon the contest. So soon as the necessity for united action ceased, the various states of the republic began to secede (1829), and in 1831 the present Colombia and Panama were constituted a separate state with the title of the Republic of New Granada. In 1886, the present constitution of Colombia was proclaimed, and in 1904, Panama seceded, and formed itself into an

* Petre, *The Republic of Colombia*, London, 1906.

independent state. The population amounts to between four and five millions, practically all of whom are Catholic.

In the innumerable revolutions and civil wars that devastated the country during the last century, the Catholic Church suffered severely at the hands of the different factions. In 1835, Gregory XVI. recognised the independence of the country, appointed bishops to the vacant sees, and endeavoured to maintain friendly relations with the republic, but, ten years later, a strongly anti-religious faction secured control in Colombia, and for a long period the Church was incessantly persecuted. The religious congregations were expelled; the clergy were placed entirely under the jurisdiction of the civil courts; the tithes and other sources of revenue were abolished; and the bishops who opposed such decrees were expelled from the country. But the vast majority of the people were not in sympathy with such a policy, and in 1885 the anti-religious government was overthrown, and a more moderate party arrived in power.

According to the constitution of 1886 the Catholic religion is recognised as the religion of the state, and the public authorities guaranteed to protect it, and to secure that it shall be respected as an essential element of social order; but it is understood that the Catholic religion is not and shall not be official, but shall be entirely independent (Art. 38). All other forms of religious worship may be exercised freely, provided that they are not opposed to Christian morality or the laws of Colombia (Art. 40). Public education is to be carried on in accordance with Catholic principles (Art. 41); and religious associations are recognised, but only on condition that they are authorised by competent religious authority (47). The Catholic Church is independent in the administration of her own affairs, and the bishop of each diocese is recognised as the *ex-officio* owner of the ecclesiastical property of the diocese (Art. 53). Finally, the churches, seminaries, episcopal

and parochial houses, are exempt from taxation. The public authorities consecrated the Republic of Colombia to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and in 1887, 1892, and 1898 conventions were agreed upon with the Holy See, according to which all matters of difficulty between the ecclesiastical and civil authorities were settled satisfactorily.*

The ecclesiastical government is carried on by four archbishops and ten bishops, together with two vicars apostolic and three prefects apostolic. The clergy are paid by the state. The schools, both primary and secondary, are thoroughly religious in their character, and most of the secondary schools are carried on by members of the religious congregations. An Apostolic delegate accredited to the government of Colombia, resides at the capital, Bogotá.

VENEZUELA.—Venezuela seceded from Colombia in 1830, and became an independent republic. Since that date it has been at the mercy of different factions, who succeeded in bringing about a revolution at regular intervals. The present constitution was established in 1904, but it does not seem to be of a more permanent character than those which preceded it. In the days of the revolution against Spain, and in the civil wars waged between the radical and moderate parties, the Catholic Church suffered severely owing to the confusion of religion and politics. It was regarded, first, as the ally of Spain, and then as the supporter of the Conservative party, and, as a consequence, the revolutionary and radical leaders felt called upon to destroy the influence of religion by every means in their power. The persecution reached its highest point during the presidency of Guzmán Blanco (1870-77). Although a concordat with the Holy See had been concluded in 1862, the dictator of Venezuela did not consider himself bound to observe any of its stipulations, except those which favoured his own

* *Conventiones inter S. Sedem et Civilem Potestatem Sub Pontif. Leonis XIII.*, Rome, 1893, XVI., XVII., XVIII.

policy of enslaving the Church. He introduced civil marriage, suppressed the religious congregations, closed the seminary, forbade priests to engage in educational work, and exiled a number of the clergy and bishops. He even went so far as to decree the establishment of a National Church free from the jurisdiction of Rome (1876). Since the retirement of Blanco (1877) the persecution of the Church has become less violent. The Catholic religion is recognised as the state religion, but in the constitution of 1901 full liberty is given for the exercise of other forms of worship. The total population of Venezuela in 1906 was 2,619,218, and the vast bulk of these belong to the Catholic Church. The archbishop of Caracas, the capital of Venezuela, is the metropolitan for the state, and he has under him five suffragan bishoprics. Besides the state schools, there are also free primary and secondary schools carried on by religious and assisted by the local or central authorities. In the universities of Caracas and Los Andes there are faculties of theology maintained by the state.

Ecuador.—Ecuador separated itself from Colombia in 1831, and became an independent republic. Its history, like that of most of the South American States, has been marked by constant wars amongst rival factions, and against the neighbouring republics. The population is about 1,400,000, the bulk of whom are Indians, or of a mixed race. Practically the entire body of the inhabitants belongs to the Catholic religion.

The early years of the Republic of Ecuador were years of persecution for the Catholic Church, especially from the revolutionary and radical faction. But a new era began with the election of García Moreno * to the presidency in 1861. He was a man of great ability, education, and energy, and for years he had been the devoted champion of the Catholic interests in Ecuador. According to the constitution which he formulated in 1861 the Catholic religion was to be the religion of the state, and

* Berthe, *García Moreno*, Paris, 1887.

was to be the only one tolerated. The civil authorities engaged to protect it, and to ensure that it would be respected. But the ecclesiastical affairs of the republic were in a dreadful state of disorganisation, and the new president determined to open up negotiations with Pius IX. for the arrangement of a concordat. It was concluded in 1862.* According to the terms of this agreement the Catholic religion was to be the only religion recognised in Ecuador, the education was to be entirely Catholic, the Pope was to be at liberty to communicate with the bishops and clergy without any state *Placet,* the bishops were authorised to administer the spiritual affairs of their dioceses without any interference from the civil power, and, hence, the appeal against abuse was abolished, the right of the Church to acquire property was admitted, the *Jus Patronatus,* which was a remnant of the Spanish rule, and which was the curse of the Church in South America, was abandoned, and in the election of bishops it was agreed that the bishops of the province should select three names, one of whom should be chosen by the president, and presented to the Pope for canonical institution. By means of this concordat the organisation of the Church was free to develop, and it became possible to root out the abuses that were then prevalent.

But it was not merely in ecclesiastical matters that Moreno signalised himself as a competent ruler. He succeeded to the presidency at a time when the finances of the state were practically bankrupt and the national credit destroyed, and by his careful management he succeeded not alone in restoring the national credit, but in considerably reducing the national debt. Schools were established throughout the country, primary, secondary, and technical, roads were made, trustworthy judges were appointed, the army was placed on a good footing, and the bands of robbers, who destroyed the peace of the country, were broken up. In 1865, his term of office was finished, but the country was so satisfied with his

* Nussi, *Conventiones,* XLVII.

administration, that his nominee for the presidency, Carrion, was returned by an overwhelming majority as against his radical opponent. The new president had not the strength of character possessed by his predecessor, and the Liberal-Radical party arranged a new revolution. Moreno, however, anticipated them. Supported by the army, and by the Conservatives, he seized the reins of government himself, convoked an assembly, and, in 1869, he was elected president for six years.

During his second term of office Moreno continued the policy of reform which he had initiated. He laboured incessantly to raise the standard of education in the country by securing competent teachers from abroad, establishing a polytechnical school, a military academy, an academy of painting and architecture, and a conservatory of music. Technical schools were established, and teachers introduced from the United States. Railways were built, and every method adopted to improve the trade and commerce of the country. The nation was solemnly dedicated to the Sacred Heart of Jesus; and, when the Italian army occupied Rome, the president of Ecuador was one of the very few Catholic rulers who ventured to utter a solemn public protest against the seizure of the Papal States. His opponents made every effort to prevent his re-election in 1875, but the vast body of the people were so satisfied with his rule, that these efforts failed miserably. Defeated in their open attacks, they resolved to have recourse to other methods. Moreno was warned that if he accepted the presidency his life was in danger, but he despised the threats, though personally he recognised the danger, and made every preparation for death. In August, 1875, he was set upon by a band of murderers, and stabbed so severely that he died in a few hours. Moreno died, as he had lived, a devoted Catholic, and even his enemies were forced to admit that during his term of office Ecuador had made great progress, materially, morally, and religiously.

On the assassination of Moreno the Radical faction seized the supreme power, and they set themselves to undo all the work that had been done by the late president. The education system was completely secularised, the concordat was suspended, the bishops and clergy who ventured to protest were punished, and, in order to renew their power over the Church the *Jus Patronatus* was revived. Their rule was, however, not prolonged, and the more moderate party secured the reins of office, and from 1878 till 1895 the Church in Ecuador was comparatively free from persecution. But in 1895, a new revolution was organised, and the Radical party was once more successful. Since that time a new era of persecution has been begun. Though the Catholic religion is still recognised as the official state religion, yet by the law of 1904 the Church and her property are placed under the control of the civil authorities, civil marriage has been made obligatory, the foundation of new religious houses has been forbidden, and foreign religious congregations are prohibited from settling in the country.

PERU.—Peru * revolted against Spain in 1821, and by the end of 1825 the Spanish forces were completely defeated. United at first to Bolivia under the rule of Bolivar, the Liberator, it desired separation, and in 1829, it became an independent republic under the rule of President Gamarra (1830). But, as in the other states, revolution succeeded revolution, till it seemed as if no stable government could be established. The population at present amounts to about three million, the majority of whom are Indians or mixed. Only a small percentage of the inhabitants is pure European.

The constitution of 1860, which is still in force, recognised the Catholic religion as the state religion, and did not tolerate any other form of religious worship. But in practice the few Protestants (c. 5,000) and Jews (500)

* Pruvonena, *Memorias y documentos para la historia de la independencia del Perú*, Paris, 1858.

are permitted to hold religious services. According to the concession made by Pius IX. the president of the republic is allowed the same rights in ecclesiastical appointments as had been allowed to the Spanish rulers. By a law passed in 1863 the seminaries were to be conducted in accordance with the directions laid down by the Council of Trent, and, in 1891, it was declared that the public authorities had no right to interfere in the management of the seminaries, except as regards the health of the students, or to prevent doctrines being taught that were dangerous for the state. The law of 1874 ordered that religious instruction be given in all primary and secondary schools, and the parish priest was *ex-officio* to be a member of the local education board. The Church in Peru is governed by an archbishop and eight bishops, assisted by a fair number of secular clergy. The position of the religious congregations in Peru has varied very much according to the views of the particular dictator who secured the supreme power. At the time of the proclamation of independence the religious congregations were forbidden to hold any communications with their superiors resident outside Peruvian territory, and were subjected entirely to the jurisdiction of the local bishops. Later on, the government suppressed all houses of religious congregations which had less than twelve resident members, and appointed a commission to deal with the revenues of the suppressed foundations. In 1876, a further decree was passed for the suppression of certain religious establishments in Luna, but the Senate refused to ratify the decree. The Jesuits were expelled in 1887, but have been allowed to return. In 1899, a great agitation was started to secure the suppression of the religious congregations, and wild rumours were circulated about the growing corruption of the body, but though the Liberal party used every effort to accomplish their object, the agitation was not successful. A project for the establishment of civil marriage has been recently vetoed by the president in accordance with the wishes of the vast body of the people.

Bolivia.—Bolivia, formerly known as the Spanish Province of Upper Peru, rose in rebellion, and under the leadership of Bolivar, after whom the Republic has been named, succeeded in establishing an independent kingdom. Since that time it has undergone many vicissitudes, changing its constitution at the bidding of various dictators, and engaging in wars with the neighbouring states. Though Bolivia has been deprived of much of its original territory, yet on account of the great natural resources of the country, for the most part undeveloped, it holds an important place among the states of South America. The population amounts to close on 2,000,000, the bulk of whom are Indians, or mixed. The Catholic religion is the religion professed by about three-fourths or more of the entire inhabitants.

The constitution drawn up in 1880 is still in force. According to the second article of that constitution the Catholic religion is recognised as the official religion of the state, and the exercise of any other form of worship is not to be tolerated except in the colonies. But in practice, at present, other religious services are tolerated. The state pays the salaries of the clergy and the expenses of public worship, and, in addition, appropriates a large amount to the conversion of the native Indian tribes who still inhabit part of the country. These are being brought together in fixed settlements, and, by the law of 1901, the missionaries who labour amongst them are entrusted with the entire temporal administration of the settlements. In the appointment of bishops, the government claims all the privileges formerly exercised by the Spanish rulers. Though at several stages in the history of Bolivia during the last century the religious orders were exposed to violent persecution, yet, at present, they are allowed to continue their work without interruption. Many of the secondary schools and primary schools are conducted by these bodies. For the education of the clergy there are preparatory seminaries, placed under the jurisdiction of the bishop, but since

1900 these institutions are obliged to follow the same course as is prescribed for the ordinary secondary schools. The theological courses are given in establishments which partake of the character of a university. In some of the centres flourishing technical schools are conducted by the Salesian Brothers. The relations between the ecclesiastical and civil authorities in Bolivia are friendly.

CHILI.—Under the leadership of O'Higgins, Chili * rose in revolt against Spain, and succeeded in securing its independence (1818). For the first years of its existence the country was subject to perpetual revolutions, but since 1850 the government of the republic has been comparatively stable. The population at present is close on 3,000,000, the great majority of whom are Catholic. In the early period of the republic, the revolutionary party handled the Church with great violence. The whole ecclesiastical property was confiscated by the state in 1824, and tithes and other sources of ecclesiastical revenue were abolished; but, on the other hand, the state undertook to pay the salaries of the clergy, and to provide for the cost of religious worship. According to the constitution of 1828, as amended by the law of 1865, the Catholic religion is recognised as the established religion of the state, and the civil authorities guarantee to protect it, and to provide financial assistance. Other forms of religious worship are, however, tolerated. At times serious difficulties have arisen between the government and the Church, especially in regard to the appointments to ecclesiastical benefices. In 1883, the trouble was so serious that the Apostolic delegate was forced to leave Chili; but, in 1888, a satisfactory settlement was concluded. It was during this period that the civil marriage law was passed (1884). The religious orders are permitted to settle freely in the country, and to engage in educational work. Many flourishing schools and colleges are conducted by

* Eyzaguirre, *Hist. eccl. polit. y liter. de Chile*, 3 vols., Valparaiso, 1850.

members of these bodies. In the public schools, both primary and secondary, religious instruction forms part of the programme, but attendance at these classes is not obligatory, and during certain periods, when the government was hostile, teachers were appointed who were not likely to give much attention to the religious training of their pupils. For the government of the Church there are a metropolitan and three suffragan bishops. The seminaries for the education of the clergy are supported by the state, and are under the immediate control of the bishop. They are far superior to similar establishments in others states of South America.

PARAGUAY.—The old Jesuit settlement of Paraguay,* from which the society had been banished by the Spanish government, rose in revolt in 1811, and secured its independence. Francia, who had taken a leading part in the revolution, became dictator, and the supreme power remained in the hands of his relatives till the disastrous war of 1870, when Paraguay was obliged to defend itself against the combined forces of Brazil, the Argentine Republic, and Uruguay. In 1870, a new constitution was adopted, and remains in force till the present time. The population in 1905 amounted to 631,347, and practically the entire body belongs to the Catholic Church. The constitution of 1870 recognised the Catholic religion as the established religion, and due provision was made for the expenses of public worship. Other forms of religious belief and worship were tolerated. The religious orders are recognised, and conduct many of the best colleges in the republic. Both private and public schools receive financial assistance from the state. In 1898, it seemed as if a conflict between Church and State could hardly be avoided. Against the protests of the bishop, a civil marriage law was introduced and passed, but owing to the energetic opposition of the bishop and clergy its operation was suspended in the following year.

* Garay, *Compendio de historia de Paraguay*, Madrid, 1896.

Uruguay.—Uruguay formed part of Brazil after the rebellion against Spain, but, in 1825, it seceded, and was recognised as an independent state by the treaty of Montevideo (1828). A constitution was drawn up and accepted in 1830, and this constitution continues in force till the present time. The population of Uruguay has increased rapidly owing to the immigration from Brazil, Spain, Portugal, and Italy. It amounted in 1900 to to 915,647.

The constitution of 1830 recognised the Catholic as the established religion, and the state contributes to the expenses of public worship. Other forms of public worship are tolerated. In the public schools the law orders that religious instruction be given by the teachers, and full permission is accorded to the religious congregations of men and women to open primary or secondary schools. The seminary is under the control of the bishop, and is managed by the Jesuit Fathers. During the presidency of Massimo Santos great hostility was shown to the Church in the upper circles of the government. The religious congregations were penalised (1885-1887), but the persecution soon died out. In 1885, a law prescribing civil marriage was introduced and passed against the protests of the bishops and clergy; but in the same law it was laid down that no cause could justify divorce. For the ecclesiastical government of Uruguay there are an archbishop resident at Montevideo and two bishops.

The Argentine Republic.—The Argentine Republic * was formally proclaimed in 1816 after the revolution against Spain. The early years of its existence were troubled by revolutions and war, but since the establishment of the constitution of 1853, the government has been comparatively stable. It is one of the most flourishing of the South American states, and its population has been largely increased in recent

* Frezals, *Situation de l'Église Catholique dans la République Argentine: Rev. Cath. des Inst. et du Droit*, 1903, XXX., pp. 340-52.

times by immigration. A strong Irish colony is settled in the republic.

The constitution of 1853 was very favourable to the Catholic Church. It was recognised as the state Church, and the government undertook to provide the salaries of the clergy and the expenses of public worship. It was declared that nobody could be eligible for election to the presidency or vice-presidency of the republic unless he professed the Catholic religion. The government was empowered to make grants for missions amongst the Indian population, and to permit the establishment of religious congregations other than those already settled in the republic. Freedom of worship was guaranteed to foreigners who did not profess the Catholic faith.

The constitution, coming immediately after the violent war that had been carried on against religion during the dictatorship of Rosas (1835-1852), was a great relief to the Church. But in practice it has not been observed closely at all times by the government. The education in the public schools is purely secular, but facilities are afforded to the clergy to give religious instruction in the schools after the regular school hours. In 1888, the law on civil marriage was passed against the protests of the bishops and of a large section of the population. The law forbids the civil registrar to interfere with the subsequent religious ceremony, and declares divorce to be illegal.

For the ecclesiastical government of the Argentine there are an archbishop at Buenos Aires, and seven suffragan bishops. According to the constitution the Senate selects three candidates for appointment to vacant bishoprics, and the president of the republic presents one of these to the Pope for canonical institution. The government, too, claims the right of appointing to parishes on the nomination of the bishop. In each of the dioceses a seminary has been established. These are supported in great measure by subsidies from the state, but they are under the immediate control of the

bishops. The religious congregations of both sexes maintain several excellent secondary schools.

Brazil.—When the French invasion compelled the royal family of Portugal to leave the kingdom they fled to the Portuguese colony of Brazil. In 1821, John IV. returned to Portugal, and left behind him his son, Dom Pedro, as his representative. The people of Brazil were opposed to be reduced once more to the position of a Portuguese colony, and, in 1822, they proclaimed Dom Pedro, Emperor of Brazil. During his reign he continued to depend largely upon Portuguese ministers and officials. This preference shown to foreigners roused the hostility of his own subjects, and, in 1831, he was obliged to abdicate in favour of his son, Dom Pedro II., who reigned as Emperor of Brazil till 1889, when he was deposed and a republican form of government introduced.

During the existence of the Empire the Church in Brazil, though the established Church, and supported by the government, was in a state of abject slavery. Nowhere else in the world were the freemason lodges more powerful than amongst the ruling classes in Brazil; and, by means of the control over the Catholic Church, which its position as the established Church gave them, they repressed every display of liberty or zeal. In the appointment of bishops, of canons, and of parish priests, the government had all the rights formerly claimed by the Portuguese Crown. The courses of study in the seminaries were arranged by government officials; and the religious congregations were in constant danger of suppression. In 1856, a decree was issued forbidding the religious orders to receive novices for the future, and, in 1870, a law was passed enabling the government to take possession of the entire property of such institutions, on condition of allowing those who had been despoiled a fixed annuity. The law was not, however, enforced.

By the Revolution of 1889, in which the Empire dis-

appeared to make way for the Republic, a change was introduced. The separation of Church and State was decreed, and for the future the state was to be neutral; no religious bodies were to receive any financial assistance; and full freedom of religion and of worship was guaranteed to every citizen of Brazil. But the separation was carried out in a generous spirit. The Church, if it lost the financial assistance previously granted, secured complete freedom. The election of bishops, henceforth, belonged entirely to the Holy See, and the bishops were free in the appointments to parishes. The seminaries were placed entirely under the jurisdiction of the bishop, and the religious congregations could be formed and hold property like any recognised civil association. The Church retained the buildings appropriated to religious service, and the property which she possessed at the date of the separation. Furthermore, she was at liberty to acquire property to any extent without restriction. The education in the primary and secondary schools was to be purely secular, but full permission was given for the erection of private schools and colleges (1891). Civil marriage was introduced, but divorce was not permitted.

The results of the Separation Law have been very favourable to the Catholic religion. The Pope is free to appoint to vacant bishoprics men who will be likely to discharge the duties of their office, and new bishoprics have been created to meet the spiritual wants of the people. The seminaries have been considerably improved, and many ecclesiastical abuses have disappeared. The religious congregations have done excellent work in the cause of education. In recent times the relations between the ecclesiastical and civil authorities have been friendly, the highest officials in the republic taking part in the religious functions and processions, while in state ceremonies the archbishop of Rio-de-Janeiro may be seen side by side with the president of the republic. A Papal nuncio resides in the capital of Brazil, and a Brazilian envoy is accredited to the Vatican.

CHAPTER V

THE CHURCH IN AUSTRALASIA

(*a*) The Catholic Church in Australia

Moran (Cardinal), *History of the Catholic Church in Australia*, 2 vols., Sydney, 1895. Coghlan, *Statistics of the Seven Colonies of Australasia*, 1886-1889, Sydney, 1902. Kenny, *Catholic Church in Australia to the Year* 1840. *Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Australiensis*, 1885, 1895, 1905. Ullathorne, *The Horrors of Transportation*, Dublin, 1836. *The Autobiography of Archbishop Ullathorne*, London, 1891. Duffy, *My Life in Two Hemispheres*, 2 vols., London, 1898. Salvado, *Memorie Storiche dell' Australia particolarmente della missione benedittina di Nuova Nurcia*, Rome, 1851. Hogan, *The Irish in Australia*, London, 1888. Cleary, *A Hundred Years of Missionary Fruits in Australia* (*Proceedings of the First Australasian Congress*, 1900). *Australasian Catholic Directory.*

In 1605, a Spanish explorer set out from Spain with the approval of the Spanish Court and the blessing of Pope Paul V. in search of the Southern Continent, and having sighted it, as he thought, on the Feast of Pentecost, he gave it the name, *Tierra Austral del Espiritu Santo*. With the rise of Holland as a great naval power, the command of the southern seas passed into the hands of the Dutch, who gave Australia the name, New Holland. It was only in 1770 that an English vessel under the command of Captain Cooke touched upon the southern coast of Australia, and landed its crew on the shores of Botany Bay. The discovery was not considered important at the time in England, but the failure of the English to reduce the insurgent American colonies made it necessary to seek

some other spot where a penal settlement could be established, and the authorities selected Botany Bay. In January, 1788, the first convict settlement was established on the shores of Port Jackson, and the name Sydney given to it in honour of Viscount Sydney, then Secretary of the Admiralty.

A certain number of the convicts transported thither were Catholics, the majority of them being transported from Ireland charged with political offences. The number of these largely increased between the years 1798 and 1804. No provision was made for the religious wants of the Catholics, and though they petitioned that a priest should be sent to assist them, and though priests volunteered to go there without any government support, the Home Office steadily refused such permission. To make the condition of the Catholic convicts still more unbearable, they were obliged, under pain of incurring heavy penalties, to attend the religious services of the official Protestant chaplain, and by the establishment of an orphan school in 1800, it was sought to deprive them of the religious education of their own children. The children of convicts were declared to come under the designation orphans, and all such orphans were to be reared as Protestants. By these means it was sought to secure the completely Protestant character of the new settlement.

The disturbances in Ireland in 1798 and the following years were responsible for the arrival of the first Irish priests in the new penal colony. Father Harold, the parish priest of Rathcoole near Dublin, was arrested at the altar on the charge of complicity in the rebellion of 1798, and was transported to Botany Bay where he arrived in January, 1800. Father Harold was not, however, permitted to minister to his Catholic fellow-convicts, and was treated with great cruelty on account of his alleged complicity in some plots which the authorities asserted were organised by the Irish Catholic convicts. He was removed to a still more undesirable settlement in Norfolk Island, and on the withdrawal of

the convicts from this in 1807 he was sent to Tasmania, whence he returned in the next year to Sydney. But his health had been so completely shattered that he was unable to do any work, and he was permitted to leave the colony. On his return to Dublin he was appointed parish priest of Kilcullen, but he soon resigned his mission, and died in Dublin in 1830.

The next priest to arrive in Sydney was Father Dixon, a curate of the diocese of Ferns, who was arrested on the charge of taking part in the Wexford rebellion. He was sentenced to death at Waterford, but the sentence was commuted to penal servitude, and in January, 1800, he arrived in Australia. He was allowed to remain at Port Jackson, and in 1802, permission was given him to minister to the spiritual wants of the Catholic convicts. In accordance with this permission Mass was offered up by him in Sydney in 1803. The guardian of the Irish Franciscan Monastery in Rome, St. Isidore's, having learned of the more tolerant attitude of the authorities in Australia, petitioned the Holy See for faculties for the three convict priests, and by a special decree Father Dixon was appointed prefect apostolic of New Holland. The shred of liberty that had been granted was soon revoked, and Father Dixon was forbidden to celebrate Mass. He returned to Ireland in 1808, and received an appointment in his native diocese of Ferns, where he died in 1840.

The third Irish convict priest to arrive in Australia was Father Peter O'Neill, a priest of the diocese of Cloyne, who was unjustly charged with complicity in the murder of an informer, and transported to Botany Bay in 1800. His conviction, however, had been secured by such evident perjury that an order was given for his release, and in 1803, he left Norfolk Island. With the departure of these three convict priests the Catholics of Australia were again without anyone to minister to their spiritual wants, and the convicts were obliged to attend the Protestant service, and allow their children to be trained in the Protestant orphan school.

The hapless condition of the Catholics of Australia was brought under the notice of Propaganda by some of the Irish Franciscans in 1816, and Father Flynn, a Cistercian, who had laboured in the West Indies, having volunteered for Australia, was appointed prefect apostolic of New Holland. Having received some assistance to equip himself for the mission as well as commendatory letters to the Irish bishops, he set out for London to seek the permission of the Colonial Office, without which he would not be allowed to land in Australia. Such permission was, however, refused, but, undaunted by such an obstacle, Father Flynn sailed for Sydney, where he arrived in November, 1817. The governor did not conceal his dissatisfaction at the arrival of such an unwelcome visitor, and forbade him to exercise any of the functions of his priestly office in the colony. Father Flynn naturally disregarded such a command, and in spite of the petitions of both the Catholic and Protestant colonists, he was arrested and shipped for England. In the house where he had been concealed the Blessed Sacrament was kept in the tabernacle, and here, during the two years that intervened before the arrival of another priest, the Catholics in Sydney used to meet in presence of their Lord.*

The mission of Father Flynn had the good effect of bringing before the public the deplorable condition of the Catholics in Australia. The Liberal party denounced the attitude of the governor of Australia as a reproach to civilisation, and so strong was the feeling aroused on the subject that the Colonial Office yielded, and announced its readiness to appoint two Catholic chaplains, one for the Botany Bay settlement, the other for Van Diemen's Land. Two priests, the Rev. Philip Conolly of the diocese of Kildare, and the Rev. John Joseph Therry of the diocese of Cork, volunteered for service in Australia. Faculties were given to them by Dr. Slater, who had been appointed previously vicar apostolic of the Cape of Good Hope, Madagascar,

* Moran, Vol. I., pp. 65-71.

Mauritius, and New Holland, and they arrived in Sydney in May, 1820.

They set to work at once among the Catholics of the Sydney district, but the regulations imposed on them by the governor were exceedingly stringent. Father Conolly volunteered to go to Tasmania, and Father Therry remained in Sydney in charge of the New South Wales colony. His first care was to provide a suitable place for the celebration of Mass, and in 1820 the foundation of the old church of St. Mary's, Sydney, was laid in the presence of the governor of the colony. Money was generously subscribed by both Catholics and Protestants, and, in 1836, the church was ready for dedication.

In spite, however, of the appointment of two Catholic chaplains, the original idea of making the colony exclusively Protestant was not abandoned. Hence, Father Therry found himself hampered at every turn by the intolerant regulations of the governor of New South Wales. He protested against the Protestant orphan schools, which were used as agencies for proselytism, but was not permitted either to visit them to instruct the Catholic children, or to send for distribution copies of the Catholic catechism. To emphasise the Protestant character of the colony, a royal grant of one-seventh of all unoccupied lands in each county was to be set apart for the maintenance of the Protestant Church and Protestant schools. Owing to the opposition raised in Australia against the establishment of the Protestant Church as the state Church this grant was withdrawn in 1834, but in the meantime 435,000 acres of land had been already appropriated for the maintenance of Church and schools.*

Father Therry was not the man to keep silent in such circumstances. He resolved to found an education society to protect the Catholic children against the orphan schools, and on account of the demands for burial fees made in case of Catholic funerals by Protes-

* Moran, Vol. I., p. 103.

tant clergymen, he determined to open separate Catholic cemeteries. Such a course of action raised a wild outcry against him, and the officials in Sydney anxious to rid themselves of his presence offered him a sum of £300 if he would retire from the colony. Needless to say, he rejected such an offer with scorn. His salary of £100 as Catholic chaplain was withdrawn (1825), and he was forbidden to minister to the soldiers or the convicts; but, in response to repeated appeals the governor revoked this prohibition in 1830. Meanwhile, two other Irish priests were appointed chaplains in New South Wales, the Rev. Daniel Power of Waterford, who died in 1830, and the Rev. Vincent Dowling, who was appointed to succeed him.

The Emancipation Act of 1829 heralded the dawn of an era of toleration in the Australian colonies. Some Irish Catholic officials were appointed to positions of trust in New South Wales, and they endeavoured to create a better feeling towards the Catholic religion. The most prominent of these were Mr. Therry, Commissioner of Bequests, and Mr. Plunkett, Solicitor-General of the colony. It was to the latter Australia owes the appointment as chaplain of Father M'Encroe (1832), who did more than any other single individual to develop the Church in New South Wales during the first half of the nineteenth century. He had been before his appointment professor in Navan seminary, and afterwards a volunteer in the diocese of Dr. England in the United States.

The Catholics in Australia had been placed under the jurisdiction of Dr. Slater, who resided in the Mauritius Island. Such an arrangement was highly unsatisfactory from the point of view of religion, and was regarded with little favour by the governor of the colony. On account of the disputes with Father Therry, the senior priest, and the consequently strained relations existing between him and the authorities, the governor of New South Wales petitioned the Colonial Office that a Catholic ecclesiastic should be appointed as the

resident superior of the Catholic mission in Australia. Dr. Morris, who had been appointed apostolic visitor to the Mauritius Islands, was called into consultation with the colonial authorities, and it was agreed that one of his volunteers, Father Ullathorne, should be appointed vicar-general of Australia, with a small allowance from the government for equipment and salary. In 1833, he arrived in Sydney, and at once put an end to the dissensions that had broken out among the Catholics in regard to the completion of St. Mary's. He secured government aid to bring the work to completion, and with the generous assistance of Fathers Therry and M'Encroe opened up new stations for the convenience of the Catholic colonists.

Dr. Ullathorne appealed to his friends in England for more volunteers, and the governor of the colony requested Dr. Bramston, the vicar apostolic of the London district, to send out four English priests for the Australian mission. The latter consulted the Benedictines, who, whilst willing to furnish the required number of clergy, suggested that the spiritual wants of Australia could be satisfied only by the appointment of a resident vicar apostolic. Hence, in 1834, Dr. Bramston petitioned the Congregation of the Propaganda to appoint Dr. Polding vicar apostolic of New Holland. The Propaganda acceded to this request by naming Dr. Polding, a Benedictine of Downside, bishop of Hiero-Caeserea *in partibus* and "vicar apostolic of New Holland, Van Diemen's Land, and the adjoining islands." Dr. Polding was consecrated bishop in 1834, and immediately set about collecting funds and securing the services of clergymen. His appeal met with a generous response, and in March, 1835, he set out for Australia, accompanied by three priests, Fathers Corcoran, Fisher, and Cotham, three Benedictine students, and three young laymen who wished to embrace the ecclesiastical state in Australia. The ship touched at Van Diemen's Land, where the bishop found Father Conolly, who had been labouring alone in

Hobart for twelve years. One of the priests and one of the students were left there to assist him.

In September, 1835, Dr. Polding, the first bishop of Australia arrived in Sydney. Dr. Ullathorne, the vicar-general, and Fathers M'Encroe and Dowling, the only priests of New South Wales, with the exception of Father Therry, who was absent, hastened to greet their bishop. The ceremony of installation was carried out on the following Sunday in the presence of an immense concourse of the Catholics of Sydney and of the district. A large house was presented to the bishop as a residence by the Catholics of Sydney, and here he opened a seminary, giving it in charge to the Rev. Charles Lovat. Governor Bourke received the new bishop with every mark of respect, a fact in itself which was sufficient to rouse the bigotry of the Protestants. Dr. Broughton, who was appointed first Protestant bishop of Australia in 1836, protested against Dr. Polding's use of the title Roman Catholic, and against his being received officially by the governor whilst he wore "the habiliments which are appropriate to the Church of Rome." It was contended by Bishop Broughton and by many of his co-religionists that the Church of England was the Established Church of New South Wales, and that, therefore, no countenance should be shown to unauthorised forms of religion.

Dr. Polding was indefatigable in his labours for the advancement of religion, in instructing the Catholics in Sydney, in administering the sacrament of confirmation, and in visiting the remote districts of the colony where Catholics were settled. He held the first ordination in Australia in May, 1836, and two days later he set out for Hobart in Van Diemen's Land. At the same time, feeling the want of a sufficient number of assistants, he commissioned Dr. Ullathorne to return and seek volunteers in Ireland and England. The mission of Dr. Ullathorne was most successful. In Kilkenny he secured the services of one priest and five ecclesiastical students, in Maynooth he received an enthusiastic

welcome and a generous response to his call for volunteers, in Dublin two Franciscans offered their services, and a small community of the Sisters of Charity agreed to accompany the vicar-general on his return to Australia. The arrival of these devoted workers enabled Dr. Polding to increase the number of permanent mission centres, and he set himself to erect additional churches and schools. The most important of the new churches was St. Patrick's in Sydney, the foundation stone of which was laid on the Feast of the Apostle of Ireland, 1836.

Dr. Polding, accompanied by Dr. Ullathorne, sailed from Australia for Europe in 1840. He arrived in England in 1841, and hastened to Ireland in search of volunteers. He visited Dublin, Maynooth, Carlow, and Cork, and was overjoyed at the numbers of priests and students who volunteered for Australia. The Christian Brothers expressed their readiness to send out a community to New South Wales, if the required permission were obtained from Rome. The Propaganda gladly acceded to the request, and a small band of Brothers started for Australia to assist in the great work of Catholic education. The bishop visited Rome in 1842, and an account of the state of the Church in the colony having been given by him to the Propaganda, it was determined that the time had come for the canonical establishment of the hierarchy. Sydney was fixed upon as the metropolitan see, and Dr. Polding was created its first archbishop. Two new sees, Hobart and Adelaide, were erected, to the first of which Dr. Willson was appointed bishop, and to the second the Rev. Francis Murphy. It was hoped that Dr. Ullathorne would have accepted the appointment to Adelaide, but as he was obnoxious to the authorities in the colony on account of his denunciations of the transportation system, and to a large portion of the Catholic community on account of the removal of Father Therry from Sydney, he declined to accept any of the newly established sees. Shortly afterwards he was appointed bishop of Bermingham.

The establishment of the hierarchy in Australia marked a new stage in the history of Catholicity in the country, and was in itself a sign of the great progress made since the foundation of the penal colony at Botany Bay. In the year 1792 there were but three hundred Catholic convicts, and a few emancipated Catholics in the whole of Australia. The rebellion in Ireland led to wholesale transportations, and, thus, the number of Catholic convicts rapidly increased. In 1817, the year of the arrival of Father Flynn, it was estimated that there were in New South Wales close on six thousand Catholics. On the arrival of Dr. Ullathorne, in 1833, the whole population of Australia (excepting Western Australia) was about sixty thousand, of whom over seventeen thousand were Catholic. There were then in Australia proper four priests, four churches constructed or partially constructed, and four schools. In Tasmania there were only one priest, and a temporary church.

But during Sir Richard Bourke's term of office a change came over the attitude of the Australian authorities towards the Catholics. Several prominent Catholics were appointed to positions in the colony, the quasi-official establishment of the Church of England was overthrown by the Church Act of 1836, and a more generous assistance was given by the government to the building of churches and to the support of the Catholic clergy and schools. As a result, the number of Catholic free immigrants to Australia increased. According to a report made by Dr. Polding in 1836, there were then in Australia six priests, with an annual salary as chaplains of about £150, six churches, seven boys' schools, and seven girls' schools, attended by five hundred and seventy-two children. The government contributed £630 for the support of the schools, and about £500 for the maintenance of the bishop.

In 1841, the year before the establishment of the hierarchy, there were about 40,000 Catholics on the mainland of Australia, of whom over 35,000 were in New South Wales (Queensland and Victoria). The rest were

scattered in small colonies through Southern and Western Australia. According to the report of Dr. Polding to the Propaganda there were in 1841 one bishop with 24 priests to assist him, a convent of the Sisters of Charity, a seminary with six ecclesiastics and twenty intern and twenty extern students, twenty-five churches or chapels, and thirty-one schools.

In 1843, Dr. Polding arrived once more in Sydney, and was welcomed by all classes. The Protestant bishop lodged a solemn protest against the assumption of the title of archbishop, but the great body of the Protestant community refused to join in the outcry. The next year, 1844, the church of St. Patrick in Sydney was solemnly dedicated, and a few months later the vicar-general of Sydney, Rev. Francis Murphy, to whose exertions the rapid erection of the church was principally due, was consecrated bishop for the new see of Adelaide, to which he had been appointed by the Holy See. This was the first episcopal consecration ever held in Australia.

There were now three bishops in Australia, the archbishop of Sydney, and the bishops of Hobart and Adelaide. It was determined to hold a provincial synod in order to introduce a common discipline into all parts of the colony. Besides the bishops, the superior of the Benedictine monastery in Sydney and the theologians, there were present at the synod twenty-seven priests. A glance at the names is sufficient to indicate that, with one or two exceptions, they were all Irishmen, or the sons of Irishmen. The regulations passed at the synod dealt principally with the duties of the clergy, the administration of the sacraments, the erection of schools, the religious instruction of the children, and the care of ecclesiastical property. The decrees were approved by the Propaganda in 1852.

The next diocese founded in Australia was that of Perth. For a long period New South Wales and Tasmania were the only places in which colonies had settled. But, in 1829, the Swan River colony, with Perth

as its capital, was formally proclaimed. Amongst the colonists were a few Irish Catholics, who petitioned the authorities in Sydney for a resident priest. In 1843, Father Brady was despatched to their assistance with full powers as vicar-general. Accompanied by one priest and a catechist, he arrived in the new colony in 1843. In a report sent to the Propaganda in 1844 he advised that a bishop should be appointed, and that special missions should be erected for the conversion of the natives, who were of a decidedly higher type than those of New South Wales. Dr. Brady himself was appointed bishop of Perth, and administrator of the vicariates apostolic of George's Sound and Port Essington, the two stations selected for the native missions.

He was consecrated at Rome in 1845, and made a tour of Italy, France, and Ireland, in order to secure volunteers. His mission was remarkably successful, and he returned to Australia, bringing with him seven priests, mostly Italian, Spanish, and French, one sub-deacon, two Benedictine novices, two lay brothers of the Congregation of the Sacred Heart of Mary, eight Irish catechists, and six Sisters of Mercy. Such a staff was entirely out of proportion to the scattered Catholic population of West Australia, and the government having refused to contribute either to the expense of their voyage out or of their support, the diocese of Perth was soon involved in grave financial difficulties. The Spanish Benedictines undertook a mission to the natives, and founded the great monastery, New Norcia, which has since been declared an independent Abbacy (1867). In consequence of the financial troubles, Dr. Brady retired from the diocese (1852), and an administrator was appointed. On the death of Dr. Brady, Dr. Griver was appointed bishop in 1873, and, with the help of the Benedictines and the Sisters of St. Joseph and the Sisters of Mercy, the work of spreading the gospel among the aborigines was carried on with great energy. Under Dr. Gibney, who was appointed coadjutor in 1887.

Catholic churches and schools have been erected, the number of clergy increased, and a new settlement for the aborigines at Beagle Bay has been placed under the care of the Trappist Fathers. In 1887, the vicariate of Kimberly, and in 1898, the diocese of Geraldton were established; so that at present in the civil colony of Western Australia there are the dioceses of Perth and of Geraldton, the diocese of Port Victoria, established in 1848, but on account of the loss of its Catholic population in the gold fever, it is administered by the bishop of Geraldton, the vicariate apostolic of Kimberly, and the prefecture apostolic of New Norcia.

The discovery of Gold in Victoria in 1851 produced a great rush of colonists to that district. A small colony had already established a settlement on the Yarra river, on the spot where the great city of Melbourne now stands. Father Geoghegan, an Irish Franciscan, was despatched from Sydney to minister to the few Catholics in the community in 1839. Shortly after his arrival further contingents of Irish Catholics, amongst them Mr. Philip O'Shanassy, destined to occupy such a high place in Victorian politics, took up their residence in Melbourne, so that in 1841, there was a total Catholic population of 2,073 in the district of Victoria. In 1847, a petition from the archbishop of Sydney was sent to Rome requesting the erection of a new episcopal see at Melbourne, and suggesting the name of Dr. Goold, an Irish priest then engaged on the mission in Sydney, as a fit person for the new office. The petition was granted, and Dr. Goold, having been consecrated in 1848, started for his new field of labour.

On his arrival, he found three priests at work in the whole diocese of Melbourne, three churches, and one school. But, in 1851, when the news spread that gold had been discovered at Ballarat, people rushed into Victoria from all divisions of Australia. Victoria was established a separate colony, with Melbourne as its capital. The number of Catholics increased from 18,014 in 1851 to 109,828 in 1861, and according to the

Census of 1901 the present Catholic population of Victoria has reached the astonishing figure of 263,710. Dr. Goold spared no pains to secure priests from Ireland to assist in ministering to his increased flock. The Cathedral of St. Patrick's was begun in 1850, the Jesuit Fathers were brought from Ireland in 1865, to take charge of St. Patrick's College, in 1868, the Christian Brothers arrived from Ireland to assist in the education of the Catholic children, in 1857, Sisters of Mercy were brought from Ireland, in 1863, Good Shepherd Nuns from Angers, and in 1884, the Little Sisters of the Poor. These different orders have multiplied their houses throughout the whole colony of Victoria.

As the number of Catholics increased Dr. Goold felt the necessity of erecting new episcopal sees. In 1873, he undertook a journey to Rome, and succeeded in securing the erection of two new bishoprics, Sandhurst and Ballarat (1874). Dr. O'Connor, a Dublin priest, was appointed to Ballarat, and Dr. Crane, an Augustinian Father, to Sandhurst. At the same time, Melbourne was raised to the dignity of a metropolitan church. At the plenary synod of Australia in 1885, to which Dr. Goold was unable to go on account of age and sickness, the Australian bishops agreed to petition for the appointment of Dr. Carr as coadjutor to the archbishop of Melbourne, and the erection of Sale as a suffragan see to Melbourne. Before the appointment was made in Rome, Dr. Goold died, and, in 1886, Dr. Carr, formerly vice-president of Maynooth, was transferred from the diocese of Galway to the archiepiscopal see of Melbourne. The new archbishop devoted himself to the work of erecting churches and schools, but more especially to the completion of St. Patrick's Cathedral, and to the introduction of religious of both sexes to assist in the work of education. He introduced into his diocese the Vincentian Fathers from Ireland, the Marist Brothers, and the Sisters of Mercy, the Sacred Heart Nuns, the Sisters of Charity, the Sisters of St. Joseph, and the Loretto Nuns.

Hence, in the state of Victoria there is at present the archiepiscopal see of Melbourne, with the three suffragan sees of Ballarat, Sandhurst, and Sale. The total Catholic population in 1901 was 263,710. The number of priests, according to the statistics of 1907, was 138 in Melbourne, 62 in Ballarat, 16 in Sale, and 60 in Sandhurst, while all are well provided with churches, schools, and charitable institutions.

South Australia was erected as a civil province by an act of Parliament passed in 1834. Convicts were to be excluded from the new province, and those only should be encouraged to settle who were possessed of means to purchase tracts of land, and supply the necessary equipment. No religion was to be endowed, but, at the same time, every effort was made to exclude Irish Catholics from settling in the new colony. In 1839, Father Benson arrived to look after the few Catholics who had managed to secure an entrance, and, in 1842, Adelaide, the capital, was fixed as an episcopal see, with Dr. Murphy of Sydney as its first bishop. The latter, who was an Irish priest, one of the volunteers of 1838, was consecrated at Sydney in 1844, and shortly afterwards started for his diocese. On his arrival he found a scattered Catholic population of 1,273, with no church and no school, and only one priest, the companion and vicar-general of Dr. Murphy.

Dr. Murphy started for Ireland in 1846, where he secured a few priests for his diocese. But in 1851, the rush from South Australia was so great that Adelaide was deserted, and the priests whom he had brought together were obliged to seek a mission elsewhere. Dr. Murphy stood by his post throughout this very difficult period, and by the aid of the money collected at Ballarat and elsewhere by one of his priests, he succeeded in clearing off the debt which he had incurred in the erection of his churches. Before the death of Dr. Murphy in 1864, there were 18 priests in Adelaide, 20 churches, and 19 schools. Under his successors, Drs. Geoghegan and Sheil, the number of Catholics rapidly increased, so that

in 1869, according to the bishop's report, there were 30,000 Catholics in the diocese, 42 churches, 50 Catholic schools and religious houses of the Jesuits, Franciscans, Brothers of the Sacred Heart, Sisters of St. Joseph, and Dominican Nuns.

On the petition of the plenary council of 1885, Adelaide was erected into a metropolitan church, with the suffragan sees of Port Augusta, erected in 1885, Port Victoria and Palmerston in South Australia, and of Perth, Geraldton, the Vicariate Apostolic of Kimberly and the Prefecture Apostolic of New Norcia in West Australia.

It was only in 1859 that Queensland was formally declared an independent colony. The first settlement in the district was the penal settlement at Moreton Bay, and long after the colony was thrown open to all very few permanent settlers arrived. In 1860, the total population of Queensland was only about 28,000, but the discovery of rich veins of gold encouraged emigration, so that in 1886 the population had risen to 322,853. In 1843, two priests were sent from Sydney to Brisbane, the capital of the colony, and about the same time Dr. Polding arrived himself in order to make arrangements for the mission to the aborigines, confided to the Passionist Fathers on Stradbrooke Island. In 1858, the archbishop of Sydney petitioned for the erection of a bishopric at Brisbane, which was granted in the following year, and Dr. Quinn, of Dublin, was appointed the first bishop. On his arrival at Brisbane he found a Catholic population of about 7,000, scattered over an immense territory, with hardly any churches or schools. By aid of an immigration society, mainly organised by the bishop, about 6,000 emigrants from Ireland were induced to settle in the colony. These were nearly all Catholics, and helped to form the backbone of the Church in the district of Brisbane. The arrival of so many Catholics was resented by the authorities, and, in 1865, the immigration society was dissolved. Before the death of the first bishop in 1881 the

Catholic population in the colony had reached 54,376. The vicariate of Cookstown, in North Queensland, was erected in 1876, and given to the care of Italian priests, who were supposed to devote their attention both to the white immigrants and the natives, but the language question proved a difficulty, and the mission was confided to the Irish Augustinians in 1882. At the petition of the plenary council of Australia, 1885, a vicariate apostolic was created for the mission at Queenstown. Rockhampton was separated from Brisbane in 1882; so that at present the 120,663 Catholics in Queensland are divided between the archiepiscopal see of Brisbane and the suffragan diocese of Rockhampton, together with the vicariate apostolic at Cookstown.

In New South Wales, Sydney was both the civil and ecclesiastical capital. The first of the suffragan sees erected was Maitland (1848), which was intended merely as the titular see for the coadjutor to the archbishop of Sydney. It was only in 1865 that an independent bishopric of Maitland was formally established, and Dr. Murray, of Dublin, was appointed bishop. According to his report to Propaganda in 1872 there were then in the diocese of Maitland about 22,000 Catholics, 14 priests, 44 churches or chapels, 16 Catholic schools, and one convent of the Dominican Nuns. In 1907, there were 46 priests, 106 churches or chapels, and a Catholic population of about 30,000.

The diocese of Goulbourn was erected in 1864, and Dr. Geoghegan was transferred thither from Adelaide, but he died before taking possession of his see. Dr. Lannigan was appointed in 1866. In 1880, the Catholic population of Goulbourn amounted to 24,000, most of whom were Irish, with 25 priests, 3 convents of the Sisters of Mercy, and Catholic schools attended by 1,700 children. At present the Catholic population is reckoned as 45,000, with 59 priests, and 101 churches and chapels.

In 1865, Bathurst was erected into a separate diocese, with Dr. O'Quinn as its first bishop. The new bishop

secured the services of a number of priests before he set out from Ireland for his distant mission. On his arrival he found only six priests scattered over a wide area, four schools, and about the same number of churches. A beautiful cathedral had, however, been erected in Bathurst at a cost of about £17,000. In 1885, there were 28 priests, 43 new churches, 56 schools, several convents of the Sisters of Mercy and the Sisters of St. Joseph, and a Catholic population of 25,000. There are at present 38 priests, 89 churches, and 27,000 Catholics in Bathurst.

Armidale was created a separate diocese in 1869, and Dr. O'Mahony of Cork was appointed its first bishop. There were then 10,000 Catholics in the district, attended by three priests, but with no decent churches, schools, or presbyteries. At present there are 24 priests, 52 churches, and a Catholic population of 25,500. In 1887, the two sees of Wilcannia and Grafton (Lismore) were erected at the request of the prelates of Australia. The Catholic population of each is about 20,000.

After the celebration of the first synod (1844), Dr. Polding, the archbishop of Sydney, worked vigorously to organise the Church in Australia. Besides attending to the erection of churches and schools in New South Wales, his duties as archbishop obliged him to undertake most laborious voyages to the distant settlements of the Continent. Being a Benedictine monk himself, and persuaded that the Benedictine discipline could be easily suited to Australian wants, he introduced a community of the monks of his order into St. Mary's Cathedral, Sydney. Difficulties, however, soon arose between the regular and secular clergy; the advisability of entrusting Irish missions to English Benedictine priests or bishops was severely criticised, even by the most esteemed of Dr. Polding's own clergy, and the whole matter was referred to the Propaganda. The Benedictine community withdrew from the cathedral in 1857, and the burning of the cathedral in 1865 severed its connection with the order.

The authorities in Rome strongly urged the archbishop to convoke a synod of the bishops of Australia, so that all differences of opinion might be amicably settled, and a common code of discipline enforced in the Church. But the scattered condition of the settlements and the difficulties of travel, considerably delayed the realisation of such a scheme. In 1858, an informal meeting was held in Melbourne, at which the archbishop of Sydney and the bishops of Melbourne and Hobart were present. A joint letter was addressed to the clergy, exhorting them to promote concord and charity among their flocks, to labour unwearingly for the salvation of souls, and to abstain from discussions in the press, in which laymen sought to bring discredit on the ecclesiastical administration.

In 1861, it was decided to convoke a synod, but the absence of some of the bishops in Europe, and the illness of others, made this impossible. Another informal meeting was, however, held at Sydney in 1862. Besides the archbishop, there were present only the bishops of Adelaide and Brisbane. Their principal work was to determine the matters upon which the future synod might usefully deliberate. They recommended that the bishops should consider the erection of new sees, the establishment of a central national seminary, education, the support of the clergy, and the advisability of a sick clerical fund. Towards the close of 1862 the synod was held in Melbourne. There were present only the archbishop of Sydney, and the bishops of Hobart, Melbourne and Brisbane. The decrees adopted have not the force of synodal decrees, as they were never forwarded to Rome for approval; but this defect has been supplied by their incorporation into the decrees of subsequent canonical synods. The fathers issued a pastoral letter to the Catholics of Australia, begging of them to assist generously in the erection of churches and institutions for the poor, and condemning secular education, the divorce law, and mixed marriages.

The total destruction of St. Mary's Cathedral,

Sydney, by fire in 1865 further delayed the promised synod. All the energies of the archbishop were required in the work of making good the loss by the erection of a still more magnificent pile. It was only in 1869 that the synod could come together in Melbourne. The synod opened in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Melbourne, on the 18th April, 1869. Amongst those who took part in the assembly were the archbishop of Sydney, and the bishops of Hobart, Melbourne, Brisbane, Bathurst, Maitland, Adelaide, and Goulbourn, the administrators of Perth and Armidale, and the superiors of the Marists and Jesuit Fathers. The decrees dealt principally with the education question, then a burning one in Australia, mixed marriages, the means of support to be provided for bishops and clergy, the administration of the sacraments and of ecclesiastical property, and the conversion of the natives. The decrees were approved at Rome in 1872, and, re-affirmed in 1885, they formed the basis of the special Australian ecclesiastical code.

The archbishop of Sydney started for Rome to take part in the Vatican Council, but the state of his health obliged him to land at Suez, and take shipping again for Australia. There were present, however, at the Council, as representatives of the Australian Church, the bishops of Brisbane, Goulbourn, Perth, Armidale, Adelaide, Melbourne, together with the bishops of Hobart and Wellington. Needless to say, the bishops of Australia were strongly in favour of Papal Infallibility; and on their return to Australia the archbishop and bishops addressed a letter to Pius IX., declaring their complete adhesion to the decrees of the Council, and their sympathy with him in the sufferings inflicted on him by the Italian occupation of Rome (1871). The archbishop petitioned that on account of his age and infirmities, a coadjutor should be appointed, and the Holy See acceded to this request by the appointment of Dom Bede Vaughan, who, like the archbishop, was an English Benedictine. The archbishop continued his

strenuous labours till death called him to his reward in 1877.

In 1883, on the death of Dr. Vaughan, the bishops of the province petitioned for the appointment of Dr. Moran, bishop of Ossory, to the archiepiscopal see of Sydney.* Their request was complied with, and, as a proof of the Pope's special interest in the Australian Church, the new archbishop was summoned to Rome in 1885 to receive the cardinal's hat. On his return, the third plenary synod of Australia was held in St. Mary's Cathedral, Sydney. Never before had the rapid development of the Catholic Church in Australia been so strikingly brought before men's minds as by the opening ceremony of the synod. Around Cardinal Moran were assembled fifteen bishops, one episcopal administrator, one vicar apostolic, the superiors of religious orders, and the theologians of the synod. The synod dealt with the question of the establishment of irremovable rectors, the appointment of a body of diocesan consultors, the advantages of Catholic societies, the dangers of godless education, the support of Catholic schools, mixed marriages, and the evangelisation of the native tribes.

At the centenary celebration of the first colonisation of Australia in 1888 the Catholics, under the lead of the Cardinal Archbishop, took a prominent part. As a memorial of the occasion they resolved to take a further step towards the completion of St. Mary's Cathedral. In Sydney their progress in numbers and in organisation during the last twenty-five years has been most remarkable. In 1884, the year in which Cardinal Moran was appointed, the Catholic population of Sydney was 93,600, with 100 priests, while at present the Catholic population is 175,000, who are ministered to by 195 priests.

* Dr. Moran had been rector of the Irish College, Rome, and afterwards secretary to Cardinal Cullen. By his works, notably the *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, *Memoir of the Venerable Oliver Plunkett*, *Essays on the Early Irish Church*, *Irish Saints in Great Britain*, he has rendered signal service to Irish ecclesiastical history.

TASMANIA.—In 1642, Commodore Tasman, after whom the island was named, landed in Tasmania, but no permanent European colony was settled there till 1803, when Tasmania or Van Diemen's Land was selected as an English convict settlement. Father Harold was there for a short time in 1805, and Father Flynn visited the colony in 1817, but the first priest commissioned to act as chaplain to the Catholic convicts was Father Conolly, who reached Van Diemen's Land in 1821. He erected a temporary chapel of very modest pretensions, and devoted himself earnestly to his work, but the conditions under which he laboured were most disheartening. The laxity of morals, only too prevalent in the settlement, the harsh treatment meted out to the unfortunate convicts, and the persistent attitude of opposition adopted by the authorities towards everything Catholic, were sufficient to discourage the most zealous worker.

After the arrival of Dr. Polding in Sydney, Father Therry was despatched to Hobart. As in Sydney, he carried on an active campaign against the Protestant orphan schools and against the Protestant system of education. Having failed to secure any redress, he set himself to erect a Catholic school, but hardly had he begun the work when the news arrived that Hobart had been erected into an episcopal see, and Dr. Willson had been appointed its first bishop. Dr. Willson entered on his duties in 1844, and, owing to some misunderstanding about the diocesan debts, the relations between the bishop and the former vicar-general were for a long time very strained. The Catholic population at that time amounted to about 10,000. Dr. Willson laboured hard to secure a complete reformation of the cruel convict system, and in this respect his labours were most successful. In 1865, Dr. Murphy, who had been consecrated coadjutor bishop of Madras in 1846, was appointed coadjutor to Dr. Willson, and, on the latter's death in the following year, succeeded as bishop of Hobart. During his time as bishop (1865-1908) the Catholic

religion made great progress. According to recent statistics there is at present a Catholic population of 30,000, with 26 priests, and 63 churches. In 1888, Hobart was declared an archbishopric.

New Zealand.—New Zealand was occupied by the Maori tribes, who were far superior in intelligence to the inhabitants of the mainland. In 1814, an English Protestant mission undertook the conversion of the natives, but the missionaries seem to have devoted their energies to the work of amassing wealth and property rather than to that of procuring converts. Some of the few Irish Catholics in the colony appealed to Dr. Polding to send a resident priest, but, however anxious he was to assist them, he found it impossible on account of the dearth of clergy to comply with their petition. He urged their case, however, with the Propaganda, and pointed out the advantages that might accrue from undertaking a mission to the native tribes; and, in 1835, the vicariate apostolic of Western Oceanica was erected by the Holy See, with Dr. Pompallier as first vicar apostolic. The work of the mission was handed over to the Marist Fathers. In 1838, the vicar and his assistants arrived in the North Island of New Zealand, where they were welcomed by an Irish merchant, who gave them his residence and erected a church close by. The English Protestant missionaries did their best to stir up the native tribes against the new arrivals, but in spite of their efforts Dr. Pompallier and his companions won over a great many of the Maori tribes.

In 1848, New Zealand was divided into two dioceses, Auckland and Wellington, Auckland being left in the charge of Bishop Pompallier, and Wellington being handed over to Dr. Viard and the Marist Fathers. The Catholic population of the whole provinces of New Zealand at that period was about 3,500 whites and about 4,500 native converts. Dr. Pompallier visited Ireland in 1850, and secured some Sisters of Mercy from Carlow, together with a number of young priests. The missions

were very successful till the war of 1860, when the native tribes rose, and endeavoured to drive out the English. In the troubles that ensued the Maori missions in Auckland were almost completely destroyed.

On the death of Dr. Pompallier, Dr. Croke was appointed bishop of Auckland, where he remained till 1874, when he became archbishop of Cashel. The mission in Wellington prospered under the care of the Marist Fathers. In 1869, the see of Dunedin was separated from Wellington, and in 1885, the plenary council petitioned that Wellington should be erected into an archiepiscopal see, with three suffragan dioceses, Auckland, Christchurch and Dunedin. The total Catholic population of New Zealand at present is about 116,500, ministered to by about 188 priests, secular and regular.

Polynesia.—The mission to the natives of the Pacific Islands, handed over by Gregory XVI. to the Marist Fathers, has proved very successful. In 1842, the vicariate apostolic of Central Oceanica was formed, which has at present a Catholic population of nearly 10,000. The vicariate apostolic of New Caledonia was established in 1847, the Catholic population of which is at present 35,000. Three years later the vicariate of Samoa and Navigators' Island was erected, and the Catholic population amounts to over 7,000, and, finally, in 1887, the prefecture apostolic of the Fiji Islands, where the number of Catholics is about 12,000.

(*b*) Synods, Organisation, Education

Moran, *op. cit.*, Chap. XVIII. *Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Australiensis*, Vol. I., 1885; Vol. II., 1895; Vol. III., 1905. *Proceedings of the Catholic Congress, Sydney*, 1900, *Melbourne*, 1904 (Education Section).

In addition to several informal meetings of the bishops two regularly constituted synods of the province of Sydney were held in 1844 in Sydney, and in 1869 at

Melbourne. In 1884, Cardinal Moran was appointed apostolic delegate, and entrusted with the commission of convoking a plenary council of the Australian bishops, which met at Sydney in November, 1885. This was the first plenary council held in the Australian Church, and since that time two others, one in 1895, the other in 1905, have been celebrated. Among the principal matters of public interest upon which the councils were called upon to legislate, were the method of electing bishops, the appointment and position of rectors, the question of education, and the missions to the native tribes.

At first the appointments to the newly created Australian sees were made by the Propaganda on the advice of some of the Australian prelates, or of others acquainted with the needs of the country and the qualifications of the candidates. As the number of Catholics increased, and as the organisation of the Church assumed a more definite shape, it was felt that some canonical method of procedure should be adopted. Hence, in 1866, by an instruction of the Propaganda, the rules laid down in 1861 for the United States were extended to Australia. For the future the bishops should send, every third year, a list of the persons whom they thought worthy of the episcopal office to the metropolitan and to the Congregation of the Propaganda. Whenever a vacancy occurred the individual bishops should send the name or names of the candidate or candidates they favoured to the metropolitan or senior bishop; and then a synod or special meeting of the bishops should be called within three months to discuss the qualifications of three candidates who were to be proposed to the Propaganda. The result of the deliberations should be reported to the Propaganda, with which the appointment ultimately rested.

This arrangement was felt to be unsatisfactory on the ground that the priests of the diocese over which the bishop was to rule were allowed no voice in the selection of their superior. Hence, in the plenary council of 1885,

a new method was proposed and accepted. According to this each bishop should draw up a document naming an administrator for his diocese after his decease. If he omitted to do so the metropolitan or the senior suffragan should appoint a diocesan administrator for the vacant diocese. It was the duty of this administrator to summon a meeting of the diocesan consultors and irremovable rectors within fifteen days, for the purpose of selecting by secret ballot the names of three priests whom they deemed most fit for the appointment. The metropolitan, or some suffragan bishop delegated by him, should preside at this assembly, or in case of a vacancy in the metropolitan church, the senior suffragan or his delegate. After this the bishops of the province should assemble, and, after due discussion of the candidates proposed by the clergy, or of others suggested by some of the bishops, three names should be selected for transmission to the Propaganda. If, however, the bishops did not approve of the list proposed by the priests they should state their reasons for such disagreement. The third plenary council (1905) adopted this procedure with a slight change. Wherever the number of diocesan consultors and irremovable rectors happened to be less than ten it was agreed that all rectors or administrators, who had served in the diocese for at least ten years, should be allowed a vote in the selection of the three candidates to be proposed to the provincial bishops and to the Propaganda.

The council in 1885 did not consider that the circumstances of the Australian Church were such as to permit the erection of canonical chapters, but they decreed that, in place of the chapter, a body of consultors should be appointed to assist the bishop in the administration of his diocese. There should be in each diocese six or four, or, in exceptional circumstances, at least two, such consultors. These consultors should be elected for a term of three years, and no consultors could be removed from office except for a grave cause, and by the advice of his colleagues. These consultors were to assist the bishop

on the matters about which the latter should be obliged to seek the opinion of his chapter if such existed, and in case of the alienation of property their advice must be given in writing.

At the same council (1885) it was decided that though the system of parishes with properly constituted parish priests could not be introduced universally, yet a few districts should be selected in each diocese, the rectors of which should enjoy the privilege of irremovability. The conditions laid down for securing appointment to such a benefice were; (1) seven years' satisfactory service in the diocese; (2) proved capability of administration; and (3) success at the *concursus* prescribed for such appointments. The *concursus* was to be held by the synodal examiners in presence of the bishop or vicar-general, and the examiners were to report about the absolute fitness or unfitness of the candidates, not about their relative merits.

The government spared no pains to establish a system of parochial and orphan schools, principally for the education of the children of the convicts. It was ordered (1790) that in every township 400 acres should be set aside for the support of the Anglican minister, and 200 acres for the maintenance of a public school. General Macquarie, the governor of New South Wales, received the same instructions in 1809, and set himself zealously to the task of providing a sufficient number of well-equipped schools. But, unfortunately, in each case the schools were entirely Protestant in their staff and teaching, and the orphan schools were so many proselytising agencies working entirely in the Protestant interest. In 1826, a royal charter was issued to make provision for the maintenance of religion and the education of youth in the colony of New South Wales. To carry out the king's wishes, a body corporate was created, of which the Protestant archdeacon and the nine senior Protestant chaplains were to be *ex-officio* members. The corporation thus established had power to administer, (1) all the lands hitherto devoted to education; (2) all the revenues

given by the governors for the same purpose; (3) all glebe lands; and (4) one-seventh of the lands in each and every county into which the colony might be divided. They were to devote the revenues from all these sources to the erection of Protestant churches, the support of ministers, and the promotion of education to be carried on under the superintendence of the Anglican clergymen. This body corporate disappeared after five years, but not before it had secured 435,765 acres for the support of the Protestant religion and education.

When Father Therry arrived he tried to effect a change especially in the orphan schools, but he was refused permission to instruct the Catholic children, or even to distribute among them copies of Catholic catechisms and prayer books, which he procured from Ireland. Not discouraged, however, by such opposition, he erected a small Catholic school beside his church and, in 1825, he established a Catholic Education society to defend the children of the Catholic poor against the system of proselytism. Moved by the protests of Father Therry and his co-religionists, the government granted a small salary to two Catholic schools, but the value of the concession may be understood by the fact that though the Catholics formed one-third of the population of the colony, the grants to the Catholic chaplain and schools amounted to only £218, while the Protestants had an archdeacon with £2,000 a year, one chaplain with £600, thirteen others drawing a salary of between £500 and £250 a year, together with the revenue of the immense estates conceded to the Protestant corporation. Again, in 1833, when, according to the statistics, the Protestant population amounted to 43,095, and the Catholic to 17,238, the Church of England received in addition to its estates over £19,000, while the Catholics obtained from the state only £800 for the chaplains, churches, and schools. In 1836, thirteen Catholic schools were in existence, attended by 520 children, and in receipt of an annual grant from the state of £630.

In 1833, Sir Richard Bourke, the governor of the

colony, forwarded a despatch to London, pointing out the inequality of the treatment meted out to the Protestants and Catholics in regard to state endowments, and suggesting that a system of primary education, similar to the national system in Ireland, should be introduced. In 1835, he received a reply approving of an undenominational system of public schools, but the Colonial Secretary added that some aid should also be given to those who might refuse to accept such a system. The bill was introduced into the Legislative Council in 1836, and, notwithstanding the persistent opposition of the Protestant clergymen, who demanded that the reading of the authorised version of the bible should be made compulsory, was carried by a large majority. To satisfy the Protestant scruples it was added that in the opinion of the Legislative Council a chapter of the authorised version should be read on the first morning of the week by the Protestant children in attendance.

In regard to the public schools the state contributed to their building, equipment, and support, while the principle followed for the private schools was the half-and-half principle, that is to say, the state agreed to grant a sum equal to the sum raised by free contribution. This was unfair to the Catholic body in many respects, but especially because it left the Protestant schools established before 1836 in possession of the immense landed endowments which they had already acquired by royal charter. This was felt by Governor Gipps, who proposed a new system more favourable to the Catholics, and more in accordance with the principles of equity, but the Church of England resisted all concessions made to Catholics, unless equivalent concessions were made to its own followers.

For ten years the educational question was the burning one in New South Wales, till at last peace was secured by the establishment of two Boards of Education, a National School Board to control the public schools, and a Denominational Board to superintend the denominational schools, both Catholic and Protestant.

The money required by these school boards was voted annually by Parliament, and the majority being favourable to the secular system, curtailed the allowance to the Denominational School Board, so that it was impossible for it to meet all necessary demands. Yet, according to the report of 1855, there were only 51 public schools in the colony, as against 151 denominational schools, but the niggardly grants made to both kinds prevented either from securing competent teachers, buildings, or equipment. Hence, the reports on the schools were far from satisfactory.

In 1866, a bill was introduced for the amendment of the education system. The plan of two boards was abolished to make way for one Council of Education, which was to control both the public and denominational schools. The appointment of teachers was withdrawn from the local managers, and vested in the Council, but Catholic teachers were to be appointed to Catholic schools; a conscience clause was rigorously enforced, and the books used in the national schools in Ireland were to be adopted. The Catholic bishops, however, opposed the introduction of Dr. Whately's *Scripture Lessons*, and, thanks to their efforts, these books were withdrawn. Though the law itself seemed fair, yet the authorities were hostile to the denominational, and especially to the Catholic schools. As a result, the inspectors were very severe in their reports on the inefficiency of the Catholic schools; Catholic teachers were appointed without proper qualifications in order to discredit their school system; objectionable teachers were retained in spite of the protests of the clergy; and numbers of the Catholic schools were deprived of their certificates. A Catholic Association was formed by Archbishop Polding in 1867 to defend Catholic educational interests, and its efforts were so successful that in 1870 many of the most objectionable features of the system were considerably modified.

But the feeling in favour of secularism in education was spreading steadily, and in 1879 the Public Instruc-

tion Bill was introduced. By this measure the Council of Education was to be suppressed, and the control of the primary schools vested in the hands of the Minister of Public Instruction. No tests were to be enforced for teachers, and the teaching was to be exclusively secular. The clergy might visit the schools, outside the regular hours of work, and instruct the children in the tenets of their own particular religion. On the other hand, however, all state aid for denominational schools was to be stopped on the last day of December, 1882. To reconcile the Protestants it was explained that secular instruction merely excluded dogmatic or polemical theology, and, besides, the use of Dr. Whately's *Scripture Lessons* was made compulsory. In spite of strong opposition the bill was carried by large majorities.

The Catholic bishops met at Sydney in 1879, and issued a joint pastoral against the proposed measure of public instruction. They explained the grounds on which they objected to the exclusion of religion from the schools, and laid down certain definite rules for the guidance of both parents and clergy. They urged the parents to send their children to Catholic schools, and they exhorted the clergy to adopt every means of securing the efficiency of such schools, while they counselled both to work in unison in defence of the rights of the Catholic taxpayer to a proper allotment of the educational grants. The pastoral of the bishops was assailed warmly by the secularists, but these attacks only served to weld the Catholics together in defence of religious education. The result was that the Public Instruction law, while destroying the Church of England schools, has served only to increase the number of Catholic schools, and to raise the standard of their efficiency.

The third plenary council (1905) exhorted the clergy to provide schools in each parish, and so important did the bishops consider this work that they advised rectors to provide schools in new parishes even before providing a church. They approved of a regular series of Catholic

books to be used in the schools, and they advised that a diocesan examiner should be appointed to report on the efficiency of the secular education provided by the Catholic schools of the diocese. The bishops renewed their protest against the injustice inflicted upon Catholics by obliging them to contribute to the support of the public schools while they maintained their own without any state aid, and, at the same time, they suggested as a settlement of the educational difficulty the adoption of the system in vogue in Canada, Ireland, or England, or the method of payment by results.

When Victoria became a separate colony in 1851 it retained the educational system existing at that period in the parent colony of New South Wales. Two boards were established to control primary education, one for the denominational, the other for the public schools. In 1862, the system of dual boards was abolished to make way for the Commissioners of Education, but, at the same time, the denominational schools retained their right to state grants. It was soon found, however, that though the Commissioners manifestly favoured the undenominational public schools, the vast majority of the people were still anxious to uphold the religious schools, and, hence, the necessity of a new and more drastic measure was felt by the government. The new Education bill was introduced in 1872. It proposed to enforce the principle of undenominationalism in all schools assisted by the state, and it was asserted by its supporters that such a measure would soon purge the colony of clericalism. But these prophecies were doomed to disappointment. The Catholic bishops had already (1869) laid down the principles which alone could satisfy Catholic aspirations in education, and the Catholics have proved their loyalty to these principles by the readiness with which they contributed to build and equip their own schools.

In Queensland, all state aid was withdrawn from denominational schools in 1876, but, notwithstanding this, the Catholic schools have continued to multiply and

flourish. In South Australia the Central Council of Education was empowered to appoint teachers to schools, and all schools which refused to accept such teachers were cut off from state aid. The secularist principles were still further enforced by the law of 1878; but in spite of both measures the Catholics have maintained their own schools. The state aid was withdrawn from the Catholic schools in Western Australia in 1854, but in response to numerous petitions it was partially restored in 1870. The grant, however, was only half that given to public schools, and it was finally withdrawn in 1895, compensation being given in proportion to the existing grants.

Before 1876 each province of New Zealand had its own educational laws; and, as a rule, the reading of the bible was obligatory in all public schools. In 1876, a common system of education was introduced which was completely secular, and which excluded all religious teaching and even the reading of the bible from the schools receiving government aid. Needless to say, the Catholics protested warmly against the introduction of the secularist system, and have proved the genuineness of their protests by establishing a system of Catholic schools. Secular instruction became obligatory by law in Tasmania in 1854, but the Catholics refused to accept it, and opened their own schools, which they continue to maintain.

According to the statistics of 1907, there were 775 Catholic primary schools in Australia, at which 104,768 children received instruction. In New Zealand the number of Catholic schools was set down as 106, with an attendance of 7,897 pupils. The total Catholic population of Australia and New Zealand was about 931,663, and, hence, if it be remembered that many Catholic children received their education at home, in higher schools, or in charitable institutions, it will be evident that the Catholics of Australia and New Zealand have proved themselves thoroughly loyal to Catholic principles in matters of education.

Nor have Catholics been slow in providing good secondary schools for the higher education of both boys and girls. The plenary councils in 1885, 1895, 1905, urged strongly the establishment of good secondary schools, and suggested that a system similar to the Irish Intermediate system should be adopted by the government. There are at present about 25 colleges for boys in Australia, and 135 boarding schools for girls, in addition to 166 superior day schools; while in New Zealand there are 2 Catholic colleges for boys, 25 for girls, and 18 higher day schools. The secondary schools are conducted for the most part by religious congregations of both sexes.

The University of Sydney was founded in 1850. It was to be completely unsectarian, but grants of land and of money were made to the different religious bodies to assist them in erecting resident affiliated colleges. The Catholics were allowed eighteen acres of land, £500 a year to help in the payment of professors, and £10,000 for the erection of buildings, on condition that an equal sum was provided from private sources. A meeting of the Catholics of Sydney was held under the presidency of Dr. Polding in 1857, and it was agreed to accept the government offer, and raise the required sum. As a result, St. John's College was established in connection with Sydney University.*

The Melbourne University was opened in 1855, and is both an examining and teaching body. The different religious bodies were permitted to open affiliated colleges in connection with the university, and the Church of England, Wesleyan, and Presbyterian bodies have already availed themselves of this privilege. Some steps have been taken and funds provided for the erection of a Catholic college, but for the present the work has not been proceeded with. The University of Adelaide was incorporated in 1874. There are, besides, a University at Hobart, in Tasmania, and the University of New

* *Parliamentary Papers relating to University Education of Catholics in British Colonies*, 1900, p. 2.

Zealand, which is only an examining body with affiliated colleges. The plenary councils of Australia adopted the instructions sent to the Irish bishops in regard to the Queen's Colleges, as containing the principles which should guide Australian Catholics in their attitude towards the state universities.

CHAPTER VI

THE CATHOLIC MISSIONS

Missiones Catholicae cura S. Congreg. de Propaganda Fide descriptae, Rome, 1907. Louvet, *Les Missions Catholiques au XIX^e Siècle*, Lyons, 1895. Piolet, *Les Missions Catholiques Françaises au XIX^e Siècle*, 6 vols., Paris, 1901-3. Werner, *Missions-Atlas*, Freiburg, 1885. *Orbis terrarum Catholicus*, Freiburg, 1890. Krose, *Katholische Missionsstatistik*, Freiburg, 1908. *Annals of the Propagation of the Faith.* Moran (Cardinal), *The Development of the Catholic Church in Great Britain and the Colonies during the Nineteenth Century* (*Proceedings of Australian Catholic Congress, Sydney*, 1900). Spalding, *The Religious Mission of the Irish People.* Maguire, *The Irish in America*, 1867. Denvir, *The Irish in Britain*, 1892. Hogan, *The Irish in Australia*, 1887.

THE condition of the Catholic Missions at the beginning of the nineteenth century was far from satisfactory, and for a time it seemed as if the missionary spirit had died out in the Church. Such indifference to the conversion of pagan nations, so foreign to the spirit of the Church, was produced by various causes that had been at work during the latter half of the eighteenth century. The low condition of religion in many of the nations of Europe, and the spirit of unbelief that had spread so rapidly, especially in France, Italy, Spain and Portugal, tended to destroy the zeal of both clerics and laymen for the spread of the Christian religion. The number of volunteers willing to undertake the hardships and risks incidental to the life of a missionary in Africa or Asia steadily diminished; while the rulers of the Catholic countries, which for centuries had afforded generous assistance and protection to the soldiers of Christ, had become either hostile or indifferent to the progress of religion.

The suppression of the Society of Jesus in France, Spain, and Portugal, and the expulsion of its members from the colonies where they had laboured so fruitfully, deprived the Christian neophytes of their most trusted advisers, and drove many of them to return once more to the rites they had abandoned. In America, in Africa, in China and Corea, the suppression of the Jesuits meant the total or partial destruction of the work that had been accomplished by years of sacrifice. At the same time, the outbreak of the French Revolution led to the confiscation of ecclesiastical property, the dissolution of the religious congregations, and the closing up of the seminaries and colleges which had been established for the education and training of the missionary volunteers. The supply of priests from France, Spain, and Portugal was suddenly stopped, and as the missionaries died out no new recruits were at hand to take their places Finally, owing to the French occupation of Rome, the energies of the Congregation of the Propaganda, which was entrusted with the general supervision of the Catholic missions, were paralysed; the local superiors did not know where to seek for direction; and, as a result, a general chaos and confusion supervened.

To a careful observer, mindful only of the human element in the Church, the total extinction of the Catholic missions seemed only a matter of years; and yet events have shown how groundless would have been such forebodings. Never was there a century when more missionary activity was shown than in the nineteenth century, and rarely, if ever, with more lasting results. In the United States of America, for example, the total Catholic population in 1800 was only about 25,000, and to-day, if the American dependencies be included, the Catholic population is close on 22 millions. In Canada, the Catholics amounted only to about 137,000 in 1800, while at present they are reckoned as 2,229,600. Australia was then only a penal colony, from which the Catholic clergy were officially excluded, and practically the only Catholic inhabitants were a few Irish convicts,

transported mainly for political offences. To-day the Catholic population of Australia, including New Zealand, Tasmania, and the adjoining islands, is 1,257,822. The total number of Catholics in England and Scotland in 1800 was about 120,000, while at present the Catholic population is over 2,130,000. The wonderful development of the Catholic Church in the English-speaking countries is one of the most consoling features in the history of the Missions in the nineteenth century. It is due in great measure to the stream of emigration from Ireland during the century. The emigrants settled in the United States, in Scotland, England, Australia, and, to a lesser extent, in Canada and South Africa. They were unaffected by the spirit of irreligion or of indifference which wrought such havoc on the Continent; and, hence, wherever they went to labour, a church was quickly provided, and the services of an Irish priest secured. In this sense it might well be contended that the Irish emigrants were the most successful missionaries of the Catholic Church in the nineteenth century.

As soon as the storm of the French Revolution had passed, and before the Church in Europe had recovered from the wounds that had been inflicted upon her, the work of reorganising the Catholic missions was begun. The Seminary for Foreign Missions in Paris, from which so many ardent workers were sent out, was re-opened in 1805, and received generous donations from the faithful. The extent of its work can be judged by the fact that, according to the official report of 1902, the Society for Foreign Missions had 1,236 missionaries engaged at work, together with 625 native priests and 35 bishops. The Congregation of the Propaganda was re-organised under Pius VII., and the College of the Propaganda, which had been closed in 1798, and again in 1809, was finally thrown open to students in 1817. In order to increase the sphere of usefulness of the Propaganda, Pius IX. divided the Congregation into two sections, one for the Latin, and the other for the Oriental, missions. In 1908, Pius X. took from under

the jurisdiction of the Propaganda the countries where the hierarchy had been established, and where the Catholic religion had reached such a stage of development that they could be regarded no longer as missionary countries. In this way the Congregation of the Propaganda is now free to concentrate all its energies upon the conversion of the pagan nations.

In addition to the Propaganda and the Seminary for Foreign Missions, colleges have been established in different parts of the world for the education of workers in the missionary field; for example, at Milan in 1850; Genoa, 1855; Brussels, 1863; Steyl, in Holland, in 1875; at Dublin, the College of All Hallows, in 1842; and in London, the Seminary of Mill Hill (1866-1869), and the College of the *Society for African Missions* at Cork. The older religious orders and congregations have thrown themselves into the missionary work with renewed vigour. The Benedictines, the Jesuits, the Franciscans, the Dominicans, and the Lazarists, are to be found in all parts in South America, Africa, and the eastern missions, and, in addition to these, new congregations were founded, such as the Marists (1832), the Oblates of Mary Immaculate (1816), the Congregation of the Holy and Immaculate Heart of Mary (1841), united with the Society of the Fathers of the Holy Ghost in 1848, the Missionaries of the Sacred Heart at Issoudoun (1855), the Seminary of African Missions at Lyons (1856), the Oblates of St. Francis of Sales at Turin (1850), the Oblates of St. Francis of Sales at Troyes (1872), and the Fathers of Our Lady of Africa, or White Fathers, in 1868. These Congregations of clergymen have been assisted in the work of the mission by devoted bands of nuns, without whose assistance the Catholic missionaries must have been unable to provide the schools, orphanages, and hospitals, which have been the best means of propagating the Catholic religion amongst the pagan nations.

The work of the missionaries is in some respects less difficult in modern times than it had been in the earlier

centuries. By means of the steamers and railways it is possible for the workers to escape much of the hardship which their predecessors were obliged to endure; while the progress of medical science has enabled them to cope with the terrible diseases that wrought such havoc formerly among the Christian missionaries in Africa, India, China, and the eastern countries. But, on the other hand, new difficulties have arisen in recent times to discourage the Catholic workers, and to impede the progress of their work. The first of these is the presence of missionaries representing the different sects of Protestantism, and their efforts to win over the non-Christian population. This competition for souls, which practically began early in the nineteenth century, and the scandal given to the pagans by the appearance of rival preachers of Christianity, all of whom profess to have the exclusive monopoly of truth, have been the greatest obstacles to the spread of the Catholic religion amongst the non-Christian peoples in modern times. Besides, the rulers of the Catholic nations of Europe, who were formerly the generous protectors of the missionaries, have ceased to take the same interest in the work of the missionaries, and have in many cases impeded rather than assisted their efforts. Yet, notwithstanding these difficulties, the Catholic Missions have achieved wonderful results, as may be seen from the statistics of the various missionary centres.

The British Colonies

India.—After the Portuguese had discovered India, the kings of Portugal, following the exhortations of the Popes, endeavoured to spread the Christian religion amongst the native inhabitants. Franciscans and Dominicans undertook the work of evangelisation, and, after the establishment of the Society of Jesus, the sons of St. Ignatius threw themselves into the work with great energy, and with remarkable success It is esti-

mated that at one time between two and three million Indians were converted, but towards the end of the eighteenth century the Christian missions in India began to decline, and it seemed as if the Catholic Church was about to be crushed out of India. The Jesuits were arrested by the Portuguese government, and transported to Europe, and, a little later, the members of the society met the same fate in French territory, while the French Revolution destroyed all hopes of recruiting a capable staff of missionaries in Europe. Besides, a storm of persecution was raised against the Church in Southern India by the Indian leader, Tippoo-Sahib, who forced thousands of his countrymen to abandon Christianity. In the Dutch possessions the Catholic religion was proscribed, and the missionaries banished, while the English naturally favoured the Protestant sects. As a consequence of all these obstacles, the number of Catholics in India gradually diminished, till in 1800 it barely reached 350,000. For these, there were an archbishop at Goa, three bishops, and four vicars apostolic.

The archbishop of Goa was primate of India. By conventions made with the Holy See, and confirmed on different occasions, the kings of Portugal enjoyed the rights of patronage over all the churches to be erected in India; while, on the other hand, the Portuguese pledged themselves to provide these churches with priests, to guarantee adequate endowments, and to protect the Catholic missionaries. In consequence of these agreements, the kings of Portugal objected to non-Portuguese missionaries going to India without the permission of the king of Portugal, and the Popes were obliged to yield, and to place all the missionaries under the direction of Portugal and of the archbishop of Goa. Such rights of patronage claimed by the kings of Portugal, though in the circumstances not indefensible, were disastrous for the Church in India, especially when, after Portugal had lost its Indian possessions with the exception of Goa, the king of Portugal still claimed the right of appointing to all sees and benefices in India. The

result of this attitude was that the churches of India were left unprovided with bishops, and the Popes were powerless to put an end to such a perilous situation. The court of Lisbon would neither appoint to the sees, nor would it permit the Propaganda to fill the vacant benefices.

Gregory XVI., who, as former Prefect of the Propaganda, was fully aware of the deplorable situation in India, appealed to the Portuguese court to appoint to the vacant sees, or to renounce its privileges (1832), but the government took no notice of his communication. In the end, the Pope resolved to create vicariates apostolic at Madras, Calcutta, Pondicherry, Ceylon, and Madura (1832-36). The archbishop of Goa refused to recognise the validity of such appointments, and, urged on by the Portuguese government, he forbade all communication with the vicars apostolic or the missionaries sent by the Propaganda. In consequence of this resistance, Gregory XVI. issued the Encyclical, *Multa praeclare* (24th April, 1838), in which he pointed out that the concessions made to Portugal were made only for the good of religion, that in the political circumstances of India, where the country had passed into the hands of England, the Portuguese claims to patronage were ruinous to the best interests of religion, and that, consequently, in virute of his authority as Supreme Pastor, he suppressed for ever the rights of patronage claimed by the king of Portugal, except within the territory of Goa.

The ecclesiastics of Goa refused to yield, and then began a lamentable struggle between the vicars apostolic appointed by the Propaganda and the bishops and clergy appointed by the king of Portugal. Throughout India each party had its following amongst the people, and each party strove to maintain possession of the churches and ecclesiastical property. In many places the schismatics of Goa had recourse to the courts and obtained legal decisions in their favour. The unfortunate Christians were puzzled as to which side they should

take in the controversy, especially as the Portuguese, too, claimed to be united with the Holy See, and in many districts the clergy of Goa succeeded in securing a large following. In 1842, the Portuguese government made overtures of peace, and proposed Joseph de Sylva y Torrès for the vacant archbishopric of Goa. Gregory XVI. appointed him in the hope that he would accept the principles laid down in the Papal Encyclical in regard to the rights of patronage (1844). But no sooner had the new archbishop arrived in India than he asserted his claims to full primatial rights over all the churches of India, whether situated in English or French territory, and to maintain his pretensions he ordained a host of ignorant priests, and despatched them to all parts of the country to oppose the legitimate clergy appointed by the Propaganda. These men, armed with the authority of a primate who had been recognised by the Pope, were able to seduce many of the Christians, and the confusion in India became more widespread.

Pius IX. besought the court of Lisbon to recall the primate, and he was recalled, but only to be replaced by a man of a similar stamp. Finally, in 1857, a concordat was agreed upon between the Holy See and Portugal, according to which the rights of patronage over certain territories were secured to Portugal, and in the remaining dioceses the Pope was to be free to make new arrangements. But the concordat remained a dead letter, and the Goa schism still continued. It was only in 1886 that Leo XIII. succeeded in inducing the king of Portugal to forego his claims, and to accept a compromise. The concordat of 1886 left the king of Portugal the rights of patronage in Goa and the suffragan dioceses, as well as a voice in the appointments to Bombay, Mangalore, Quillon, and Trichinopoly. In the other dioceses the Pope was free to make any regulations that he deemed necessary.

Hence, in 1886, by the Bull, *Humanae salutis auctor,* Leo XIII. divided India into eight ecclesiastical provinces. The present Catholic population of India, in-

cluding Ceylon, is about two and a quarter millions. For these there are 826 European clergy, and 1,015 native clergy. Very many of the religious congregations of both sexes have established communities in different parts of India. The Catholic colleges and primary schools are in a flourishing condition, about 145,441 children being educated in the Catholic primary schools, in addition to about 10,000 who are being trained in the orphanages. For the education of the clergy about 46 seminaries, preparatory and theological, have been established.

South Africa.—During the period of Dutch domination at the Cape the Catholic religion was proscribed, and for a long time every care was taken to prevent priests from settling in the colony. About the beginning of the nineteenth century, owing to the state of affairs in Europe, a more liberal spirit began to prevail; and when in 1806, the territory passed into the hands of the English, it was found that three priests were actually engaged in the mission. They were promptly arrested, and sent out of the colony. From that time till about 1817 there is no record of any clergyman having visited the Cape territory, but a number of Catholics from Ireland and elsewhere had settled there, and the government deemed it advisable that a Catholic clergyman should be appointed. The Propaganda appointed Dr. Slater, an English Benedictine, to be vicar apostolic of the Cape of Good Hope; but the authorities, though willing to accept a chaplain, prohibited the vicar apostolic from taking up his residence in the colony. Hence, it became necessary to change the designation of Dr. Slater, and to appoint him vicar apostolic of the Mauritius Islands. It was only in 1837 that the difficulties raised by the government could be overcome, and that a vicar apostolic of the Cape was named in the person of Dr Griffiths, an Irish Dominican. The government did not, however, give him official recognition, or grant him financial assistance. The new

vicar found ecclesiastical affairs in a very bad condition. The churchwardens claimed the ownership of the property, and it required some strong action on the part of the bishop before he succeeded in reducing this body to subjection. In the course of time other priests arrived from Ireland, and the Sisters of Loretto were introduced from Rathfarnham and Navan. The increased population made it necessary to erect new vicariates in other parts of South Africa, and thus the dimensions of the vicariate of the Cape were gradually reduced, till at the present time it embraces only the western portion of South Africa. The Catholic population of the western vicariate is about 19,880, including the soldiers and European residents. Catholic schools have been erected in connection with the churches, a flourishing college is conducted by the Marist Brothers, and a handsome cathedral has been built in Capetown.

The Eastern Vicariate of Cape Colony.—This vicariate was erected in 1847, and comprised the eastern portion of Cape Colony, Natal, the Orange River Free State, the Transvaal, Basutoland, and Zululand. Since that time the extent of the vicariate has been very much reduced. In spite of great opposition very considerable progress has been made in building up an ecclesiastical organisation in the eastern vicariate during the past fifty years. The Jesuits have an excellent college at Grahamstown, and schools have been opened in connection with the Catholic mission centres by the Marist Brothers and the different communities of Sisters. The present Catholic population of the vicariate amounts to about 13,349.

The Prefecture Apostolic of Central Cape Colony. In 1873, this territory was separated from the western and eastern vicariates, and was entrusted to the Society for Foreign Missions of Lyons, but in 1882, they resigned their charge, and the prefecture was given over to the

Oblates of Mary Immaculate. In 1884, the district was restored to the jurisdiction of the vicar apostolic of the Western District. The total number of Catholics is about 700.

Natal.—Natal, which had once been a Portuguese settlement, was captured by the Dutch in 1721, but these, too, were soon obliged to quit the country owing to the fierce opposition of the native inhabitants. It was annexed by Great Britain in 1843, and was erected into a separate colony in 1856. In 1850, the vicariate apostolic of Natal was established, and was confided to the Oblates of Mary Immaculate. The Catholic population is about 5,000. A college, which serves also as a seminary, has been erected at Pietermaritzburg, and several good primary schools have been established. The missionaries belong entirely to the Congregation of the Oblates.

The Vicariate of Orange River.—This vicariate was established in 1886, and though the Boers were not particularly friendly to Catholicity, the president of the republic and the civil authorities gave a warm welcome to the newly-appointed vicar apostolic on his arrival in Bloemfontein. The total Catholic population is about 6,000. The Marist Brothers, the Sisters of the Holy Family, and the Sisters of Nazareth conduct the Catholic schools and orphanages.

Prefecture of Basutoland.—The Catholic missionaries were very successful in their efforts to convert the Basutos, and in 1881 this mission was detached from Natal, and erected into a separate prefecture. The mission is in charge of the Oblates, who are assisted in the schools by the Sisters of Nazareth. The Catholic population at present is about 9,700.

The Transvaal.—The prefecture apostolic of the Transvaal was erected in 1886. It embraced the whole

Boer territory in the Transvaal State. The Boers were rather hostile to the Catholics, and some of the old laws excluding Catholics from certain public positions were maintained in force. Since the incorporation of the Transvaal a vicar apostolic has been appointed for the state. The Oblates have charge of the mission, and are assisted by the Marist Brothers, the Loretto Sisters, the Sisters of the Holy Family, and the Dominican Sisters. According to the Census of 1904, the total Catholic population of the Transvaal and Swaziland was 16,481.

Kimberley.—The Prefecture of Kimberley was erected in 1884. Most of the territory embraced by the mission belongs to England, and the remainder to Germany. The Oblates have charge of the work, and devote their attention principally to the conversion of the natives. The number of Catholics is about 4,000. Schools have been established in the principal Christian centres. In the entire territory of South Africa, including the English, German, and Portuguese states, there are at present about 92,840 Catholics out of a total population of close on ten millions.

The Mauritius Islands.—The population of this island in 1810, when it became a British colony, was about 65,000, of whom 10,000 were French or of French descent. The archbishop of Paris was the ecclesiastical superior from whom the clergy resident on the island were obliged to obtain their faculties; but when Dr. Slater began work as vicar apostolic in 1820, the French clergy were recalled, and nobody could be found to take their place. In 1841, a diocese was erected at Port Louis, and Dr. Collier, a Benedictine, was appointed the first bishop. He succeeded in securing a few Irish and French clergy, and later on a community of nuns from Rathfarnham in Ireland. The governors of the island and their subordinates were most hostile to the Catholics, and took every opportunity of placing obstacles in the way of the missionaries, yet, in spite of the official

encouragement given to the Protestant clergy, the Catholic population has continued to increase. According to the Census of 1901, there were in the island 113,224 Catholics, 6,644 Protestants, 206,131 Hindus, and 41,208 Mohammedans. The present bishop, Dr. O'Neill, is assisted by a staff of about 50 priests and eight communities of nuns. On account of the secular system of education it has been necessary to erect Catholic parochial schools, and, in addition, colleges both for boys and girls have been established. The diocese of Port Louis has its own seminary. The different religious communities are supposed to receive proportionate state aid.

GIBRALTAR.—Till 1806 this territory was under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Cadiz, but it was then erected into a separate vicariate. Owing to the fact that the administration of the ecclesiastical property was in the hands of a committee of laymen, who were supported by the government in their resistance to the ecclesiastical authorities, the state of affairs in Gibraltar was very unsatisfactory. In 1835, a petition was presented on the part of the Irish soldiers stationed there asking for the appointment of an Irish chaplain; and, in 1839, Dr. Hughes, an Irish Franciscan, was consecrated bishop, and appointed vicar apostolic of Gibraltar. The lay committee opposed him at every turn, and even went so far as to bring him before the civil courts. The situation finally became so painful that he was obliged to retire, but the Propaganda showed its approval of his conduct by decreeing the dissolution of the committee. It was only in 1857 that the dispute was satisfactorily settled.

The total population of Gibraltar is about 20,000, of whom fully 15,000 are Catholics. The annual grant to Catholic and Protestant communities is £500. The Catholic schools are conducted by the Christian Brothers and the Loretto nuns, and receive financial assistance from the government. The Catholic hospitals are in charge of the religious congregations.

Malta.—The island of Malta was taken by the British in 1800, and was formally conceded to them by the award of the Congress of Vienna. It has a population of about 206,700, of whom nearly 99 per cent. are Catholics. The English government has paid due attention to the religious feelings of the Maltese. The system of education from the primary schools to the university is based entirely on Catholic principles. The primary schools were organised by Sir Patrick Keenan, and the annual government grant for their support amounts to over £25,000. The secondary schools are also purely Catholic, and are maintained by the state. In addition to these, there is a university in Malta, which is supported in part by the interest on the property of the Knights of St. John, and in part by grants from the state. The latter amounted to £4,245 in 1899. In the university there are four faculties, theology, law, medicine, literature and science, and the average number of persons educated in the establishment annually is about 114.*

The West Indias.—The West India Islands.—In 1819, the numerous islands along the American coast were grouped together by the Propaganda under the vicariate of Antilles, and confided to the charge of a vicar apostolic, Dr. Buckley. Later on, in 1835, Trinidad became itself a vicariate, and, finally, in 1850, the hierarchy was formally established. Port-of-Spain, the capital of Trinidad, became an archiepiscopal see, with Roseau as its suffragan. Vicariates apostolic have been erected in Jamaica, Demerara (British Guiana), and in British Honduras. The archdiocese of Port-of-Spain includes the islands of Trinidad, Tobago, Grenada, St. Vincent, and St. Lucia. Trinidad was captured by England from France in 1797. Most of the inhabitants were then Catholics, but the number of priests was small, and the organisation of the Church was entirely

* *Papers Relating to University Education of Roman Catholics in Certain Colonies*, *Parliamentary Report*, 1900.

neglected. Under the care of Dr. MacDonnell (1828-1844) and Dr. Smith a large number of priests were brought from Ireland, and some of the Irish congregations of nuns were introduced. The men who did the best service in Trinidad were Irish Dominicans, and the religious care of the island is entrusted to the Dominican Fathers. The total population of Trinidad and Tobago in 1899 was 273,938, of whom 193,335 were Christians. The Catholics were reckoned at this period as 89,213. A flourishing college is conducted in Port-of-Spain by the Fathers of the Holy Ghost. The Island of Grenada was placed under the care of Dr. Hynes in 1833, and is at present divided into six districts, entrusted for the most part to Irish Dominicans. In Grenada and the adjacent islands there are about 23,854 Catholics out of a total population of 45,000. Saint Lucia was finally ceded by France to England in 1815, but the majority of the inhabitants are French. Out of a population of 45,000, about 35,000 are Catholics. The resident clergy are all French. Saint Vincent has a Catholic population of 3,120.

The diocese of Roseau includes Dominica, Antigua, Montserrat, and St. Christopher, together with the Danish Islands of Santa Cruz and St. Thomas. The total Catholic population amounts to about 40,000, the majority of whom belong to the island of Dominica. The first bishop, Dr. Monaghan, was Irish, but the majority of the clergy at present are French, and are members of the Congregations of the Oblates or Redemptorists. Montserrat was a favourite settlement for the Irish immigrants to the West Indies, and Santa Cruz could boast of a strong colony from Ireland in the middle of the eighteenth century. The Danish authorities tolerated the Catholic religion, and the Irish Dominicans sent a few of their number to minister to the spiritual wants of the Catholics. Towards the close of the century, however, the liberty of worship was restricted, and many of the inhabitants left the island. The Catholic population at present is about 7,000, and the mission is in charge of Redemptorists.

Jamaica.—From the time when the island of Jamaica came under the English rule till the close of the eighteenth century, the Catholic religion was forbidden by law, and priests were excluded from settling in the colony. The Protestant Church was recognised as the state Church, and was richly endowed until the act of disestablishment in 1870. The persecution maintained against Catholics helps to explain why, out of a population of 639,491, only about 14,000 are Catholics. The vast majority, however, of the inhabitants are still pagan. In 1838, the vicariate apostolic of Jamaica was created, but, except for a few priests who arrived from Ireland at irregular intervals, very little was done to provide for the spiritual wants of the Catholic community. In 1877, the vicariate was entrusted to the Jesuit Fathers, and since that time considerable progress has been made. Churches, colleges, schools, and orphanages have been built, and have been entrusted to the care of religious congregations, notably to the Salesian Brothers, to the Franciscans, and the Sisters of Mercy. In the Bahamas and the Bermudas very few Catholics are to be found.

British Honduras was separated from the vicariate of Jamaica in 1888, erected into a separate vicariate, and entrusted to the Jesuit Fathers. The total population is 37,479 (1901), of whom about 23,000 are Catholics. The Sisters of Mercy have a few flourishing schools.

British Guiana was captured from the Dutch in 1803. During the Dutch rule the Catholic religion was proscribed, but the English authorities granted toleration. An Irish Dominican, Father Hayes, was the first priest who made an effort to organise the Catholic community. In 1838, Dr. Clancy, coadjutor bishop of Charleston, was appointed vicar apostolic of British Guiana, and succeeded in securing the services of a few Irish priests. At that time the total population of the district was 100,000, of whom only about 3,000 were Europeans. The Catholics amounted to about 5,000. In 1857, the mission was entrusted to the Jesuit Fathers. The

Catholic population at present is about 20,500. The Church of England and the Scotch Presbyterian Churches are officially recognised and endowed by the state, and a proportionate allowance is made to the Catholics for the maintenance of their institutions.

The Falkland Islands form part of the diocese of Southern Patagonia, and are under the care of the Salesian Fathers. The total population in 1906 was about 2,065, but no religious census was taken.

Missions in Western Asia

To understand the organisation of the Catholic Church in these countries, where the schismatical churches are predominant, it is necessary to remember that the jurisdiction of the bishops or patriarchs is not so much territorial as personal. It extends rather to the faithful who belong to a certain rite than to all Catholics residing in any particular district. Hence, in the same city, as, for example, in Aleppo, there might be three or four bishops or archbishops in residence, all of whom might be in communion with Rome. Besides the Latin rite there are also the Greek rite (Greeks, Ruthenians, Roumanians, Greek Melchites), the Armenian, the Maronite (in Libya and Syria), the Syriac (Syria and Mesopotamia), and the Chaldean (Mesopotamia, Kurdistan, Persia, India). Besides these, there is the Coptic in Egypt, and the Abyssinian in Abyssinia. It will be necessary, then, to deal briefly with the followers of these different rites.

The Latin rite was introduced into these countries during the Crusades when Latin patriarchates were instituted at Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople. But after the fall of the Latin kingdom in the East during the thirteenth century, the Latin hierarchy existed only in name, and at the beginning of the nineteenth century was represented only by the vicar apostolic of Aleppo, the bishop of Babylon, and the Franciscan guardian of the Holy Land. Several sees

were erected during the nineteenth century, and, in addition to the different branches of the Franciscans, other religious orders have engaged in the work, notably the Jesuits, the Dominicans, and the Lazarists. There are at present a patriarchate of Jerusalem, the archbishoprics of Smyrna and Bagdad, the vicariates apostolic of Aleppo and Arabia, the prefecture apostolic of Mardin, and the Missions of Mosul (Dominican), Persia (Lazarist), and Armenia (Jesuit). The total population belonging to the Latin rite in 1890 was 36,868. The Jesuits have a flourishing university at Beirut, and the Dominicans a college at Mosul and a school of Biblical Studies in Jerusalem.

Greek Melchites.—The Greek Melchites (Royal) were designated "Royal" by their opponents on account of the protection given to them by the Emperor Marcian during the disputes about the Council of Chalcedon. They were bitterly persecuted by the Turks and by the Mohammedans, but after 1834 a better era opened for the unfortunate Melchites. In 1882, a seminary was opened at Jerusalem for the education of their clergy. The total number of this body united with Rome is at present 138,733,* most of whom are resident in Syria. Their hierarchy has been completely reorganised during the nineteenth century.

Armenian Rite.—The Armenians were not so badly disposed towards Western Christianity as were most of the other Eastern nations. During the crusades, they co-operated loyally with the Western Crusaders, and a fair proportion of them entered into communion with Rome. But the persecution of the schismatics, and the defection of some of their own patriarchs, tended to reduce the influence of Rome. In 1742, Benedict XIV. established the patriarchate of Cilicia, and Pius IX. erected six new dioceses in Asia Minor. In 1867, Cilicia and Constantinople were united, and Mgr. Hassoun,

* Krose, *Missionsstatistik*, p. 76.

resident in Constantinople, became patriarch of the Armenians. During the Vatican Council a schism broke out amongst the Armenian body; an intruder was appointed patriarch, and the small body who rejected the Vatican decrees were recognised by the Sultan as the owners of the entire ecclesiastical property. Mgr. Hassoun was exiled, and those who remained faithful to him were persecuted. But in 1878, the schism was ended, and in 1880, Mgr. Hassoun was created a cardinal by Leo XIII. The total number of Armenian Catholics united to Rome is close on 100,000.

The Maronites.—The Maronites alone amongst these Eastern peoples have never allowed themselves to be drawn into heresy or schism. Though surrounded by the Mohammedans, the Druses, and the heretical and schismatical Christian bodies, they remained faithful to Rome. They have, however, paid dearly for this attachment in the persecution which they were obliged to undergo, especially in 1860, when the Druses massacred whole villages, and ravaged their entire territory. The hierarchy has been completely organised, and the total number of the Catholic body is about 300,000.

The Syriac Rite.—Under the patriarchate of Mgr. Giarves (1820-1851) the movement towards a union with Rome made decided progress. Four of the principal Jacobite bishops renounced their heresy, and were received into the Church; but the news of their conversion only served to arouse a storm of persecution. Since 1866, however, when the Syriac Uniates were recognised by the Sultan as a legal religious body, great advances have been made. After the Vatican Council, the schismatics endeavoured to excite the Sultan against the Catholics in union with Rome, and for some time the position of affairs was extremely critical. The total number of Catholics belonging to the Syriac rite is about 20,000.

The Syro-Chaldaic Rite.—The Chaldeans embraced Nestorianism, and it was only in the sixteenth century that some of them began to return to the unity of the Church. Owing to persecution and neglect great numbers again fell away from the faith, and in 1840 only 15,000 remained true to Rome. Since that time considerable progress has been made. After the Vatican Council a new schism broke out, but it was healed during the reign of Leo XIII. The total number of Catholics belonging to the Chaldean rite is about 63,000.*

Missions in Eastern Asia

China.—Many obstacles have impeded the spread of the Catholic religion in China during the nineteenth century. The unfortunate dispute between the Jesuits and some of the other religious orders regarding the Chinese rites led to the almost complete destruction of the flourishing communities which the Jesuits had organised at such sacrifice of life and energy, and it created a spirit of hostility against the Catholic missionaries in the minds of those in authority. Besides, the Chinese connected the missionaries with the European powers, and were suspicious lest, under the guise of religion, they might open the way to foreign intervention in the internal affairs of the Empire. From 1795 till 1820 a violent persecution was carried on against the Christians, and during these years thousands of Catholics were slain. By the *Treaty of Nanking* (1842) it was agreed that the missionaries should be allowed to build churches in five of the principal seaports, and that they should be allowed to continue their work without fear of persecution. Owing to the murder of a French priest, France joined with England in 1856, and forced China to conclude two treaties, *T'ien-tsen* (1858) and *Peking* (1860), according to which full compensation was to be made to the Christians for the losses that they

* Krose, *Missionsstatistik*, p. 77.

had suffered; the churches of Peking were restored to the Catholics; and the missionaries were to be at liberty to continue their work in all parts of the Empire.

Though the persecution of the Christians was still carried on by many of the local officials, yet the French protectorate secured to the Catholic Church a large measure of freedom. In 1885, negotiations were opened with the Pope, and arrangements were being made for the appointment of a Papal representative at the Chinese court, but France having objected to such a step the idea was abandoned. In 1901, it was agreed that Germany should protect the German Catholic missionaries, and since that time Italy has claimed the protection of the Italian Christians; but, as the French form the largest portion of the missionaries, the French protectorate remains practically undisturbed. In 1899, an imperial decree was issued formally recognising the position of the Catholic Church in the Empire, and giving the bishops a legal and social standing in the country by putting them on a level of equality with the first class civil functionaries, but the Boxer Rebellion (1899-1900), which was a reaction against foreign interference in Chinese affairs, led to a fearful popular outburst against the Christians. Many of the clergy and people were martyred, the churches destroyed, and the Christian communities scattered. The European powers were obliged to intervene for the defence of their interests, and by the peace of 1901 compensation was made for the injuries that had been done, and liberty to preach the Christian faith was again secured.

Various religious bodies are engaged at work on the Chinese missions. The Jesuits, who, in the seventeenth century had done such excellent work in China, returned in 1842, and have laboured since then with remarkable success. The Lazarists, the Dominicans, the Franciscans, the Society for Foreign Missions, and the Augustinians, have charge of different districts of the Empire. By a Papal decree of 1875 China has been divided into five ecclesiastical regions, which are sub-

divided into 36 vicariates apostolic, 2 prefectures apostolic, and 1 mission station. Many seminaries have been established for the education of the native clergy, who, in several districts, are more numerous than the foreign missionaries. The total Catholic population at present is 1,042,196.* In Siam, the province of Birma, the Strait Settlements, and the Malay States, which are under the protection of England, and the provinces of Annam, Cochin-China, &c., which are dependent upon France, there are about one million Catholics.

Corea.—The vicariate apostolic of Corea was created in 1831, but the decrees against Christians were so severe that it was with the greatest difficulty that the Christian missionaries could succeed in setting foot upon the territory. In 1839, a violent persecution broke out, and the vicar apostolic, together with his two assistants, was put to death. Notwithstanding the persecution, the little Christian community continued to increase. In 1866, it had reached the total of 25,000, but in that year another campaign against the Christians was organised, and two bishops, with seven missionaries, were put to death. In 1876, a new vicar apostolic attempted to land in the country. He was seized and thrown into prison, from which he was set free only at the urgent request of the French government. Since 1879 a brighter era has opened for the Catholic Church. The total Catholic population at present is about 64,000. A seminary has been opened for the education of the native clergy, and schools, both primary and secondary, have been established by the Catholic congregations.

Japan.—The Catholic missions in Japan, which had been formerly so flourishing, were almost completely annihilated in the seventeenth century. In 1846, Gregory XVI. re-established the vicariate apostolic of Japan, and confided it to the care of the Seminary for Foreign Missions; but it was only in 1861 that the

* *Annuaire Pontifical Catholique*, 1909.

Christian missionaries were permitted to settle, and then only in a few of the seaport towns. In 1862, Pius IX. canonised twenty-six Japanese Martyrs, who had suffered during the sixteenth century, and, curiously enough, the consecration of a new church built in honour of them at Nagasaki led to the discovery of a number of Japanese Christians, the remnants of the former Catholic missions in Japan. A new persecution broke out in 1868, and lasted till 1873. Thousands were put to death; others died in prison, or were exiled from the country. The representatives of the European powers at the court of the Mikado protested vigorously against such barbarity, and, as a result, liberty of worship was conceded. Since that time the Catholic missionaries have been allowed to exercise their functions freely, and their labours were so successful that in 1891 Leo XIII. established an archbishopric at Tokio, together with three suffragan sees. Seminaries for the education of the clergy, colleges, schools, orphanages, and hospitals have been established. The total Catholic population at present is about 60,000.

Africa.—In the western portion of North Africa, including Cameroon, North and South Nigeria, Gold Coast, Sierra Leone, Portuguese Guinea, French Guinea, Dahomey, Senegal, Gambia, Algeria, Tunis, the Sahara, Morocco, and Liberia, there are 737,032 Catholics, over 600,000 of whom are in Algeria and Tunis. In the eastern portion of North Africa, including Tripoli, Egypt, Soudan, Erythrea, Somaliland, and Abyssinia, there are 145,359 Catholics, together with about 50,000 catechumens. In Central Africa, including the English, German, and Portuguese territory, and the Congo, there are over a million Catholics, and close on 250,000 catechumens, while in the islands off the African coast there are close on 500,000 Catholics.*

* Krose, *Missionsstatistik*, pp. 89-107.

CHAPTER VII

RELIGIOUS ORDERS AND CONGREGATIONS

Braunsberger, *Rückblick auf das Kathol. Ordenswesen im XIX Jahrhundert*, Freiburg, 1901. Heimbucher, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der Kathol. Kirche*, Paderborn, 1907. Steele, *Monasteries and Religious Houses of Great Britain and Ireland*, London, 1903. Murphy, *Terra Incognita, or The Convents of the United Kingdom*, London, 1873.

THE spirit of unbelief, so prevalent among the better classes in the latter half of the eighteenth century, was not favourable to the development of religious orders. The Society of Jesus, which had done so much for the Church during the reformation struggles, and which, by its educational institutions, was endeavouring to stem the tide of rationalism that threatened to inundate Europe, was suppressed in France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, and Austria. Only in Russia could the members of the society find a place where they might continue their institution. The suppression of the Jesuits removed the ablest and most energetic opponents of the infidel philosophy, and helped to prepare the way for the French Revolution. During the stormy days of the Revolution the religious orders were almost extinguished. In France, these bodies were suppressed (1790), their property confiscated, and their members sent out into the world, or condemned to come together into a few houses, where they were dependent upon a miserable government pension. The wars of the Revolution and of Napoleon, the secularisation of ecclesiastical property, and the new political re-organisation of

Europe, helped to complete in Europe the work of destruction that had been begun in France.

Yet, in spite of these misfortunes, the nineteenth century has witnessed a great revival of the religious orders and congregations throughout the Catholic world. Under the Restoration governments the old communities were re-established with less wealth and possessions than before, but with more liberty, and freed from the abuses which had tended to cripple their energies during the preceding centuries. New congregations were set up to meet the pressing wants of the time. In education, in preaching the Gospel to the pagan peoples, in the work of popular missions, and in conducting various kinds of charitable institutions, the religious orders and congregations have contributed much to the great revival of the Catholic religion which has manifested itself in the nineteenth century.

The Benedictines suffered much from the reforms of Joseph II. in Austria, and from the French Revolution. After these storms had passed only about thirty of the great Benedictine abbies remained, but though the houses, lands, and libraries were nearly all lost, the spirit of the founder still remained; and the Benedictines have been re-established to carry on the tradition of scholarship which has always been characteristic of their order. They are divided at present into nineteen separate congregations, together with a number of independent houses. All these have their own special statutes modelled upon the rule of St. Benedict, and are, practically speaking, independent. In order to bind these different congregations more closely together Leo XIII. appointed an abbot primate of the Benedictines (1893), but his jurisdiction is so limited that the traditional autonomy of the various congregations may be said to be untouched.

It is the Benedictines who have already given to the Church such men as D'Achéry, Mabillon, Ruinart, Martène, &c., and it is the Benedictines who, more than any other religious body, have striven to maintain

the highest level of Catholic scholarship in the nineteenth century. Amongst the most prominent Benedictines of the century may be reckoned Cardinal Pitra (1812-1889), Tosti (1811-1897), Bäumer (1845-1894), Gasquet, Morin, Cabrol, Butler, Pothier, Mocquereau, Besse, and Chapman. The colleges conducted by members of the order for the secondary education of Catholic boys are highly esteemed, and in Austria and Bavaria many of the state lycees are entrusted to their charge. Besides undertaking ordinary parochial work in England, Germany, Switzerland, Austria, and America various congregations of the Benedictines labour with great success in the foreign missions, especially in Zanzibar, New Zealand, Western Australia, South Africa, India, Brazil, Argentina, and amongst the Indians in Dakota and North-Western Canada. The total number of Benedictines of the various congregations amounts at present to about 6,000.

The different bodies of the Cistercian Order suffered much from the Revolution, but in the nineteenth century many of their houses have been re-established, and several new ones founded. Leo XIII., anxious to secure a union of the various congregations, summoned a general chapter of the Reformed Cistercians at Rome in 1892. A union was effected, and a new general of the whole body appointed. In 1902, the Pope solemnly confirmed the union under the title of the "Order of Reformed Cistercians of the Strict Observance." This order has at present about 71 monasteries scattered over France, Belgium, Italy, Holland, Germany, England, Ireland, and America, with about 4,000 members. The Pope invited the Cistercians of the Common Observance to join in the re-union conference of 1892, but they preferred to maintain their independence. They are divided into five separate congregations, and have a common general.

Leo XIII. undertook the work of bringing about a closer union between the different groups into which

the Friars Minors, or Franciscans were divided. By a decree published in 1897 the old division into Conventuals, Capuchins, and Observantines, was retained, but the four groups into which the Observantines had been divided, namely, the Observants, the Alcantarins, the Reformed, and the Recollects, were ordered to come together into one body under one general. The total number of Capuchins is at present over 9,000, of Conventuals about 1,500, and of Observantines about 17,000.

The Dominicans were seriously affected by the decrees of Joseph II. against the religious orders as well as by the Revolution in France, the secularisation policy in the German States, and the different political disturbances in Spain, Portugal, Italy, and South America. Notwithstanding these reverses, however, the Order of St. Dominick has continued to live and flourish in the nineteenth century. The members of the order are devoted principally to education, popular missions, and the spread of the gospel amongst the pagan peoples. In addition to the secondary schools which they conduct in various countries they have charge of the theological faculty in the University of Freiburg in Switzerland, a house of general studies at Gratz in Austria, the Minerva University in Rome, and the School of Biblical Studies in Jerusalem. In the work of re-introducing the philosophy of St. Thomas into the Catholic universities and colleges Leo XIII. found willing and capable assistants in the professors of the Dominican Order. Among the many remarkable members of the order during the century may be mentioned Lacordaire, who brought back the Dominicans to France, Monsabré, Zigliara, Gonzalez, Marchese, Guidi, Denifle, Weiss, Lagrange (editor of *La Revue Biblique*), and Scheil, professor at the École des Hautes Études, Paris.

The Society of Jesus seems to have been the object of special attack from the enemies of the Church. Expelled from France in 1764, from Spain in 1767, from Naples in the same year, from Malta in 1768, and

from Portugal in 1769, the Society was dissolved by Clement XIV. in 1773. It continued to exist in Russia, and many of the former Jesuits were kept together in two new congregations, one, the Society of the Heart of Jesus, founded in Luxemburg and Belgium by Tournely and de Broglie (1794), the other, the Society of the Faith of Jesus, founded in Rome in 1798. Both these were united in 1799, and furnished a band of able recruits when the society was re-established. In Russia, the Jesuits were specially encouraged by Paul I., and received from Pius VII., by the Brief, *Catholicae Fidei* (7th March, 1801), perfect legal recognition. In 1804, the society was re-established for the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, and spread into the Papal States and Parma, while in 1813 the Jesuits were canonically and publicly re-established in Ireland, England, and America. Finally, by the Bull, *Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum* (7th Aug., 1814), Pius VII. re-established the society for the whole Church.

Since 1814, the history of the Jesuits in most of the countries of Europe has been marked by intermittent expulsions and persecutions. In 1820, they were expelled from Russia, where they had so long found a welcome and a home. Re-introduced into France in 1815, they soon acquired control of several of the secondary colleges, but by the decrees of 1828 these schools were closed, and the Jesuits themselves were expelled in 1830. They returned in 1832, were forced to yield before the attacks of the Liberals and the University in 1845, returned and flourished under Napoleon III. and during the early years of the Third Republic. The Jesuit schools were the best in France, and attracted the pupils from the state lycees. Hence, the government determined to suppress them, and the order was given in 1880 that the Jesuits should be expelled. In the recent campaigns against the religious congregations in France the Jesuits were amongst the first to suffer.

In Spain, they were welcomed after the restoration of the society in 1814, but were expelled during the Revo-

lution of 1820. They returned in 1823, and were driven out in 1835, and once more in 1868. Portugal protested against the re-establishment of the Jesuits, yet they were gladly received into the kingdom in 1829, and entrusted with the theological teaching in the University of Coimbra which sorely needed reformation. During the civil war Dom Pedro, who was bitterly hostile to the Church, suppressed the religious congregations, and suppressed the Jesuits. Since that time the society has had no legal recognition in the kingdom of Portugal. During the revolution of 1848 the Jesuits were driven from Rome and most of the states of Italy, and although allowed to return when the storm had passed, they were the object of persecution by the government of Piedmont. Many of their houses were seized, and since the establishment of the new kingdom of Italy, and the seizure of the Papal States, the position of the society even in Rome is sufficiently precarious.

The society was formally brought back to Switzerland in 1815, and colleges were opened at Freiburg and at Lucerne (1845). It was the introduction of the Jesuits into Lucerne that mainly led to the war of the Sonderbund, and on the complete overthrow of the Catholic party the Jesuits were banished from Switzerland. In the states of Germany they established many houses and schools, but by the imperial decree of 1872 they were expelled from the Empire. This decree has been in part superseded by the law of 1904. In Austria the Jesuit colleges were remarkably good. With the advent of the Liberal party to power, however, many of the privileges granted to these colleges were withdrawn. By a brief of the 13th July, 1886, Leo XIII. acknowledged the great services which had been rendered to the Church by the Society of Jesus, and confirmed all the privileges that had been granted to it since the time of St. Ignatius.

In addition to their labours on the foreign missions, and their work in conducting retreats for the faithful and clergy, the Jesuits have devoted themselves mainly

to education. Many of the most successful secondary schools in the continental countries, and in Ireland, England, America, and Australia, are carried on by members of the society, who have also in their charge the Gregorian University in Rome, the theological faculty of Innsbruck University and of Salamanca, the Georgetown University, and several minor institutes in the United States, and the School of Beirut in Asia Minor. Besides, the Jesuits have conducted successfully such reviews as the *Civiltà Cattolica* (founded 1850), *The Month* (1864), *Les Études littéraires et religieuses* (1854), *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* (1876), *Razon y Fè, Die Katholischen Missionen* (1873), *The Messenger of the Sacred Heart* in the different countries, and the weekly review, *America* (1909). It is unnecessary to give a complete list of the many distinguished scholars produced by the Society of Jesus during the nineteenth century. It is sufficient to say that in every branch of ecclesiastical science, in theology, both dogmatic and moral, in biblical studies, in apologetics, history, sacred eloquence, canon law, and liturgy, the members of the society hold a leading place.

In addition to the older orders and the congregations, various new congregations were established during the nineteenth century. The principal of these are the Fathers of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary or the Picpus Fathers, founded at Poitiers in 1802; the Basilians, founded at Annonay (1800-1802); the Society of Mary, founded by Père Colin at Lyons in 1832; the Congregation of the Holy and Immaculate Heart of Mary, founded by the Venerable Liebermann in 1841, and united with the Fathers of the Holy Ghost in 1848; the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, founded by Père Mazenod at Aix, 1816; the Oblates of St. Francis of Sales, founded at Turin by Don Bosco in 1850; the Society of African Missions of Lyons, founded by Mgr. Marion de Bréssilac in 1856; the Fathers of Our Lady of Africa, or the White Fathers, founded by Mgr.

Lavigerie in 1868; and the Missionaries of Mill Hill, London, founded by Dr. Vaughan in 1866.

For the education in the primary schools the Brothers of Christian Instruction were established by Jean de Lamennais (1816-1818), the Marist Brothers by Abbè Champagnat in 1817, the Xaverian Brothers by Ryken at Bruges in 1839, the Irish Christian Brothers by Edmond Rice in 1802, the Presentation Brothers, and the Brothers of Saint Patrick by Dr. Delaney, bishop of Kildare and Leighlin in 1808.

Amongst the congregations of nuns founded in the nineteenth century, the principal ones are the Sisters of the Sacred Heart in 1800, the Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny in 1819, the Sisters of the Good Pastor in 1829, the Little Sisters of the Poor in 1840, the Sisters of the Cross in 1844, the Sisters of St. Elizabeth in 1842, the Irish Sisters of Charity in 1815, the Irish Sisters of Mercy in 1831, the Loretto Nuns in 1821, and the Sisters of St. Louis, introduced into Ireland in 1859.

CHAPTER VIII

THEOLOGICAL ERRORS AND DEVELOPMENTS

Bellamy, *La Théologie Catholique au XIX^e Siècle*, Paris, 1904. Schwane, *Dogmengeschichte der Neueren Zeit*, Freiburg, 1890. Wiener, *Geschichte der Kathol. Theologie in Deutschland*, 2 Auf., Munich, 1889. Séché, *Les Derniers Jansénistes depuis la ruine de Port-Royal jusqu'à nos jours*, 1710-1870, 3 vols., Paris, 1891-92. Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, 10th ed., Freiburg, 1908.

The Jansenists as a distinct heretical body were practically dead in France before the year 1800. A few religious communities, and two or three insignificant groups in Paris, Lyons, and Parmenie, in the department of Isère, were the only bodies openly refusing to accept the Bull, *Unigenitus* (1713). These latter groups exist till the present time, and retain possession of the funds which belonged to the entire body; but their numbers are so few that they can exercise no influence on the religious thought of France. The Jansenist sect in Holland has an archbishop at Utrecht, and two bishops at Haarlem and Deventer. The total numerical strength of the body is about 9,000. In 1853, when the hierarchy was re-established in Holland, they joined with the Protestants in the outcry against Papal interference, on the ground that they alone represented the Catholic Church in Holland. They rejected the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception (1854), and of Papal Infallibility (1870). In the struggle begun by the Old Catholic party in Germany and Switzerland they took a prominent part, and their bishops consecrated the first bishop for the Old Catholics in Germany.

But though the Jansenists as a distinct body had practically disappeared, Jansenism still exercised a considerable influence, especially in France and Italy. It was the bitterness caused by the Jansenist disturbance that contributed in great measure to the expulsion of the Jesuits from France, and to the hostility displayed against that body by many of the leading men in the country. The Jansenists' attacks on the Catholic Church, and the miracles to which they appealed in favour of their doctrines, served as useful weapons in the campaign undertaken by Voltaire and the Encyclopedists against the Catholic religion. During the Revolution the Jansenist sympathisers urged on the confiscation of the ecclesiastical property, the imposition of the Civil Constitution, and the attacks upon the Papacy. Everywhere the Jansenists were willing to league themselves with the enemies of the Holy See; and this fact accounts for the close alliance between Jansenism and Gallicanism, which was so apparent in France and in Tuscany towards the end of the eighteenth century. The false rigorism of the sect exercised a great influence upon the teaching of moral theology during the first half of the nineteenth century, as is evident from the fact that the works of St. Alphonsus de Ligouri were carefully excluded from French seminaries. It was designated the *Theologia Moralis seu potius Immoralis,* and a preacher who dared to expound the principles of St. Alphonsus in 1829 in the diocese of Quimper was publicly interrupted by the bishop, who declared that he did not accept such principles. Gradually, however, the teaching of St. Alphonsus and of the Jesuits succeeded in driving out the false rigorism which served only to exclude the faithful from the sacraments. The Encyclical of Pius X. on Frequent Communion has dealt a fatal blow to the old rigorism of the schools.

But if Jansenism were a spent force at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the same did not hold good of Gallicanism, which continued to flourish under Napoleon I. and the Restoration government. Galli-

canism, as embodied in the articles of 1682, meant freedom from the Pope, but subjection to the king. In other words, the principles of 1682 led logically to the establishment of a National Church nominally subject to Rome, but in reality controlled by the king. The Revolution destroyed the Church of the old regime, but it did not destroy the principles upon which the Gallican theory was founded; and in 1801, when the concordat restored peace to the Church, Napoleon enforced his authority by promulgating the Organic Articles. He insisted, too, that the four Articles of the Declaration of 1682 should be taught in all the seminaries. Many of the bishops appointed by him, such as Rohan, Barral, Maury, Duvoisin, &c., were quite willing to accede to nearly all his demands, and to take his side in the quarrel with Pius VII. The National Council of 1811 went far to carry out the plan of establishing a French National Church, but, fortunately, the resistance of some of the bishops, and the political disasters that overtook the Empire of Napoleon, prevented the realisation of the scheme.

Under the Restoration, Gallicanism continued to flourish. The concordat of 1817 did, indeed, abolish the Organic Articles, but the Liberal party in the Chambers was powerful enough to secure the rejection of the scheme. The bishops were selected, as a rule, from the ranks of the nobility, and were anxious to support the throne at all costs. Hence it is, that though the body of the clergy were not Gallican, the most representative of the bishops were strong supporters of Gallican principles. The three cardinals, Talleyrand-Perigord, Luzerne, and Bausset, were Gallicans, and Frayssinous, one of the most distinguished of the French apologists, endeavoured to revive the Gallican movement by his book, *Les Vrais Principes de l'Église Gallicane*. Louis XVIII. ordered that all professors in seminaries should teach the four Gallican Articles, and Charles X. induced several of the bishops to sign the Declaration of 1682. In the seminaries, Bailly's works, and *La*

Theologie de Toulouse, both of which were strongly Gallican in tone were almost exclusively adopted as the text-books, and even such a writer as Carrière showed himself in sympathy with a mitigated form of Gallicanism in his *Praelectiones* (1837).

Notwithstanding these facts, however, Gallicanism, as such, was on the decline. The first great blow dealt to it in the nineteenth century was given, strangely enough, by Napoleon. By his action in inducing Pius VII. to demand the resignations of the French bishops in 1801, he brought into prominence the absolute power of the Pope as the head of the Catholic Church, and accustomed Frenchmen, both lay and clerical, to look to the Pope as the supreme arbiter, not alone on questions of faith but also on those of discipline. The opposition, too, of M. Émery, the respected Superior of St. Sulpice, and of many of the bishops to the government of the Church regardless of the Pope, showed clearly that the French people were not friendly to the establishment of a National Church. In fact, the treatment meted out by Napoleon to Pius VII. only served to win for the Pope the sympathy of French Catholics, and to confirm them in their allegiance to him as the head of the Church. The writings, too, of men like the Vicomte de Bonald, and of Joseph de Maistre, helped to turn the tide against Gallicanism. De Maistre was a native of Savoy, and representative of the Bourbons at St. Petersburg from 1802 till 1817. He was a man of good education, of brilliant intellectual power, and master of a literary style hardly inferior to that of Voltaire. In his works, *Du Pape, De l'Église Gallicane,* and *Les Soirées de Saint Pétersbourg,* he emphasised the divine origin of authority in human society, the influence of the Catholic Church as an opponent of rebellion, the dangerous tendencies of heresy and schism as a standing encouragement to insubordination even in political affairs, and the necessity for all rulers to yield obedience to the Pope, who is the visible representative of God upon earth. De Maistre was not a trained

theologian, nor are his books free from many mistakes both in arguments and in conclusions, but it is impossible to deny that they exercised a great influence in the Catholic revival of the nineteenth century, and especially in strengthening the Conservative party in their struggle against Gallicanism.

De Lamennais in his early years conducted a violent campaign against Jansenism and Gallicanism. In his earlier works, *Réflexions sur l'état d'Église en France pendant le XVIII^e^. siècle, et sur sa situation actuelle,* and *Tradition de l'Église sur l'institution des évêques,* he urged the necessity for reforms especially in ecclesiastical studies, and the obligation of entire submission to the Pope, the successor of St. Peter, to whom Christ had confided the supreme jurisdiction in the Church. Lamennais gathered round him a brilliant band of writers, Rohrbacher, Gerbet, Salinis, Lacordaire, and Gousset, all of whom were the declared enemies of Gallicanism, and the supporters of the Papal power. In their reviews and papers, *Mémorial Catholique* (1824), *Annales de la Philosophie* (1830), and *L'Avenir* (1830), they attacked the state of education in the seminaries, the subserviency of the French bishops, the Organic Articles, and the principles of Gallicanism. For them the first step on the path of reform was the recognition of the Pope as the infallible teacher of the Church. Unfortunately, the tone adopted by them, and the exaggerated principles which they advanced, led to a union of the French bishops in opposition to them, but, whatever be their faults, it is certain that the writers of the de Lamennais school dealt a blow to Gallicanism from which it never recovered.

Nor did the condemnation of de Lamennais in 1832 destroy the work that had been accomplished. His followers recognised the blunders that had been made, and united under Montalembert and Lacordaire to form a distinct Catholic party, the principal object of which was to secure liberty of education. The partial separation between the bishops and the government under

Louis Philippe, and the return of the religious orders, helped to strengthen the anti-Gallican movement. As proof of this we may point to the condemnation of Dupin's Gallican *Canon Law* by 65 bishops of France in 1845, the campaign successfully undertaken by Dom Guéranger for the abolition of the particular French liturgies and the introduction of the Roman liturgy, the condemnation of the Theology of Bailly (1852), and of the *Canon Law* of Lequeux (1851). The provincial councils held in France (1849-1853) completed the destruction of Gallicanism. The synod of Amiens (1853) accepted the supreme and infallible authority of the Pope, and the synod of Rochelle (1853) demanded the establishment of a French seminary in Rome. From this time, though the names "Gallican" and "Ultramontane" were bandied about by the two great parties into which French Catholics were divided, Gallicanism was practically extinct. The decrees of the Vatican Council made it impossible to revive such a theory of Church government.

In the territories of the Holy Roman Empire the soil was prepared for Gallicanism by the so-called *Aufklärung* (enlightenment) movement. In Protestant circles in Germany the teaching of Kant led to the rejection of authority, and the setting up of human reason as the only safe guide in matters of religion. Similar ideas began to make themselves felt in Catholic circles, especially in Austria and Bavaria. Philosophy and theology should be reformed so as to bring them into line with the dictates of reason, and, especially, they must be purified from the errors of Scholasticism and of Jesuitical casuistry. In dogmatic theology, moral theology, scripture, ecclesiastical history and canon law, these principles were followed by Catholic writers, some of whom were connected with the universities, others, members of religious congregations. In their attacks on the Papacy, and their expositions of theology and scripture, the Catholic writers imitated the tactics of the non-Catholic scholars, and were encouraged to do so by

the leading authorities in the Empire. Joseph II. gave the *Aufklärung* movement his thorough support, as did also most of the members of his court. Fortunately, the movement was resisted by the lower clergy, and especially by the ex-Jesuits, and never succeeded in finding favour amongst the masses of the people.

But the *Aufklärung* movement prepared the way for the reception of the Gallican principles on the other side of the Rhine The work of Febronius, *De Statu Ecclesiae et de legitima potestate Romani Pontificis* (1763), was welcomed by the higher classes in Germany, and by not a few of the bishops. Though Febronius himself retracted in 1778, and died in communion with the Church (1790), his theories remained, as is shown by the *Punctuation of Ems,* drawn up and published by the archbishops of Treves, Mayence, Cologne, and Salzburg (1786), and by the reforms of Joseph II. The plan of a German National Church entertained by the archbishops and by the Emperor was defeated, however, owing to the stern opposition of Pacca, then nuncio at Cologne, and the resistance of the bishops, clergy, and great body of the people. The outbreak of the French Revolution, the wars with the Republic and with Napoleon, the downfall of the Empire, and the secularisation of the states of the prince bishops who had led the movement for a National Church, dealt a severe blow at the anti-Papal party in the Empire. But the project of a National Church was not abandoned. Von Wessenberg strove hard at Paris and at Frankfort to bring the project to a successful issue, but the German people showed no sympathy with such a plan. After the reconstitution of the different German states, the rulers proceeded to govern the Church without any reference to the Papacy, but they were obliged to abandon such an attitude, and to negotiate concordats with the Holy See.

The causes that led to the downfall of the anti-Papal movement in Germany were, in the first place, the reaction against rebellion, and in favour of the main-

tenance of authority both political and religious. The German Romantic School, drawing its inspiration from the Middle Ages, did for Germany what de Maistre did for France. The writings of men like Schlegel, Stolberg and Görres, roused the faith of the people, turned their thoughts towards religion, and inclined them to a closer union with Rome, the centre of spiritual authority. In the second place, the secularisation of the property of the prince bishops and of the Church, and the persecution carried on in the Protestant states against the Catholics, forced the bishops to turn to Rome for assistance. Deserted by the civil authorities, their only hope of safety lay in their close union with the Holy See, while, finally, the arrest of Clement Augustus of Cologne, and the persecution carried on against the Church in Prussia, Baden, Würtemberg, &c., forced the Catholics to form political parties, and these parties naturally put themselves into close connection with the head of the Church. Hence, the secularisation policy, and the persecution carried on by the Protestant and by the Liberal Catholic governments had one good result, namely, the complete suppression of Febronianism and Josephism.

Faith and Reason

The alarming spread of irreligion and rationalism in the eighteenth century, and the deification of human reason during the French Revolution, could not fail to attract the notice of Catholic apologists. The new philosophy had rendered so many of the traditional arguments apparently worthless that it was necessary to adopt new arguments and new lines of defence. Hence it is that many of the Christian apologists of the period, *e.g.*, Chateaubriand, de Bonald, Stolberg, &c., did not rest their defence of Christianity on mere intellectual grounds, but appealed rather to the beauty of the Catholic religion, and its suitability to the wants and

tastes of the human race. In other words, they appealed more to sentiment than to reason. But others were obliged to meet the difficulties drawn from reason, and many of these took up a position of complete distrust of the powers of the human intellect. They answered the deification of human reason by showing that reason was in itself incapable of arriving at truth, and that revelation was the only source from which true knowledge could be derived. Authority, therefore, not reason, was the only safe guide towards truth.

This school is referred to generally as the Traditionalist school. The system was not an entirely novel one, but it reached its period of greatest development in the nineteenth century. Vicomte de Bonald (1754-1840) is one of the first writers of the century to reduce the theory to systematic form. He maintained that human language was not invented by man, but was given by God, and that, furthermore, language was not alone the medium for the communication of thought, but the medium of thought, so that an intellect without language is as a human eye without light. Hence, in the beginning, with the language God must have given a body of truths, and these truths were handed down with language from generation to generation. Had he stopped with stating these things as facts his theory was not objectionable; but he went further by asserting that without this revelation human reason by itself would have been entirely unable to arrive at knowledge, and that the only guarantee for human certainty is the infallibility of God, the Revealer.

Félicité de Lamennais, in his *Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de religion* (1818-1824), followed to some extent in the footsteps of de Bonald. He accepted the position that the individual mind was incapable of arriving at certainty, and that the only safe criterion was the collective judgment (*sensus communis*) of mankind. The collective judgment of the human race was a criterion of truth on account of the primitive Divine Revelation which was the source from which all truth

known to man is originally derived. By means of this criterion he endeavoured to prove the truths of natural theology and of the Catholic religion, but in doing so he was obliged to adopt a historical method that in itself would have been sufficient to condemn any system. Lamennais himself clearly felt the weakness of his position, for in his later work, *Esquisse d'une philosophie* (1841), he abandoned the distinction between natural and supernatural truth, and adopted a modified form of Pantheism.

But not all the followers of de Bonald adopted the extreme views of Lamennais. De Maistre, Gerbet, and Bautain tried to avoid the dangers to which extreme Traditionalism was exposed by putting the system forward in a milder form. Bautain (1796-1867) is the principal representative of this school. As a disciple of Cousin and Fichte his opinions were completely unsettled, nor could he find any certainty except in the Christian revelation. Hence, while professor in Strassburg, he began to teach that the human intellect, left to itself, cannot come to a knowledge of the existence or of the attributes of God, nor can miracles or prophecies prove the fact that a divine revelation was really given. Hence, the only way of arriving at certainty on these points is through faith which comes from the internal illumination given by God, and from the idea of the infinite which was revealed to the first human being, and handed down by tradition to later generations. Faith in God and in the Scriptures and teaching of the Church was his supreme criterion of truth; and hence his system is known as *Fideism*. The bishop of Strassburg, alarmed at the possible results of a system which rejected the motives of credibility and left faith without any reasonable basis, condemned the doctrine of Bautain (1834), and the condemnation of the bishop was approved by Gregory XVI. In 1840, Bautain went to Rome to defend his theory, but was induced to sign a profession of faith in regard to the points on which he erred. Later on, in 1844, he pledged himself to abstain

from teaching his theories. He retired from Strassburg, and died in 1867 as vicar-general of Paris.

The traditionalism of Bautain was adopted in a milder form by Bonnetty (1798-1879), the director of *Les Annales de philosophie chrétienne*. He asserted that though human reason left to itself is able to arrive at a great body of truth, it is unable to acquire certainty about God or His attributes, man, his origin and final end, and the rules of civil and domestic society (1853). The Congregation of the Index condemned these views, and required Bonnetty to sign the formula that had been accepted already by Bautain (1855). Ventura (1792-1861), an Italian Theatine, held views closely identified with those of Bonnetty, but he admitted that though human reason could not of itself discover the religious and moral truths, it could prove the truth of them, and defend them once it had acquired them by tradition. The University of Louvain was the last stronghold of Traditionalism in the nineteenth century. Professor Ubaghs laboured hard from 1840 till 1860 to discover a formula which might satisfy the requirements of orthodoxy. Twice, in 1843 and 1844, his teaching was condemned, and after years of careful study he prepared a new statement of his views, which he forwarded to Rome in 1860. In this he taught that education is necessary for the development of the human mind so as to render it capable of acquiring a distinct knowledge of God or of moral truth, that this necessity, at least in the present economy, is an absolute physical necessity, so that without a primitive revelation man could never have arrived at these truths. Such a theory, implying as it did that revelation was not gratuitous and supernatural, was condemned in 1864, and again in 1866.

Ontologists

The Traditionalists hoped to ward off the attacks of the Rationalists by taking refuge in a primitive revelation, the Ontologists by appealing to an intuitive vision of

God through which created things can be known. Though the theory had been put forward already by Malebranche (1638-1715), the system assumed a new form during the nineteenth century in the hands of the Italian priest, Gioberti (1801-1852). He held that if our knowledge has any value it must correspond with things as they are in themselves, and that, therefore, since God is the First Being, from whom all others depend, the idea of God must be the first idea, and through it a knowledge of created things is acquired. This idea of God cannot be acquired from created things, since it is presupposed by the knowledge of created things, and, therefore, it can come only from direct intuition of God. By means of this intuition of God as the Creator of existing things a knowledge of the objective world is obtained, and by means of language this knowledge assumes its concrete shape. The Ontologism of Gioberti found favour especially in Southern Italy and in France Its principal exponents in Italy were Romano, Fornari, and Giovanni; but it met with stern opposition from the Jesuits, Liberatore, Kleutgen, and Cornoldi. The French Oratorian, Père Gratry (1805-1872), borrowed something of the principles of Gioberti in the philosophic system which he propounded. By a decree of the Congregation of the Inquisition (18th Sept., 1861), seven propositions, embodying the mildest form of Ontologism, were condemned as doctrines which could not be propounded safely (*tuto doceri non posse*).

The doctrines put forward by Rosmini are generally regarded as having some affinity with Ontologism. Rosmini (1797-1855) was the founder of the Institute of Charity (1828), and after a stormy period of political life during the early years of the pontificate of Pius IX., retired to Stresa, where he led a most edifying life in one of the houses of his congregation. In his philosophy he was an Idealist. In human thought he distinguished two elements, one, the matter of thought, namely, sensation; the other, the form, namely, ideal

universal being (*l'essere ideale, ente universale*). This form remained unchanged, and could not have arisen from experience or reflexion. It was an innate idea implanted by God, and in some of his works Rosmini seemed to identify this idea of universal being with the divine essence. In other portions of his philosophy, notably with regard to the human soul and its faculties, the principles of Rosmini appear to have led him into positions very different from the traditional Catholic teaching. By a decree of the Holy Office (14th Dec., 1887) forty propositions taken from his works were condemned.

The German School

The Traditionalists and Ontologists sought to meet the attacks of the modern philosophers by showing that human reason was not a safe guide, at least in religious matters, that authority was the only method of arriving at certainty, and that, therefore, the theories of the rationalists were but idle speculations. Entrenched behind revelation, they could not be dislodged by reason. On the other hand, the German scholars, ignorant for the most part of scholastic philosophy, and versed principally in the philosophic systems of Kant, Fichte, Hegel, and Schelling, thought that these systems could be brought into harmony with the dogmas of the Church; but, as events showed, it was rather the dogmas of the Church that were made to harmonise with the conclusions of the German philosophers.

One of the best known, though not the earliest of the school, is George Hermes (1775-1831). As a student of Kant and Fichte he began to doubt about the truths of the Catholic religion, but having satisfied himself of its divine character, he laboured hard as a professor in Münster and Bonn to formulate a philosophic basis for Christianity in accordance with what he considered to be the demands of modern philosophy. For him doubt

was the only safe starting point or basis for all theological inquiry, and human reason the only safe guide in acquiring a certain knowledge of the supernatural truths. For him faith was not an assent on account of the authority of God, nor were the motives of credibility such as could be proved with certainty. Yet, on the other hand, the assent of faith was a necessary assent, because practical reason taught man that it was his duty to believe. The assent of faith was, therefore, according to Hermes, neither free nor dependent upon grace. Guided by such principles, it is not difficult to understand how Hermes was led into serious errors about God and the attributes of God, the necessity of grace, the doctrine of eternal rewards and punishments, the nature of original sin and its consequences, the Scriptures, tradition, and the teaching authority of the Church.

The teaching of Hermes found opponents even in his own lifetime; but it was only after his death in 1831 that the Hermesian controversy assumed alarming proportions. His pupils had possession of many of the chairs in the universities, seminaries, and lyceums, and in order to defend the teaching of their master they founded the *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Katholische Theologie*. The principal opponents of Hermesianism were Windischmann and Binterim, supported by Clement Augustus, Bishop of Münster, while its principal supporters were Professors Achterfeld and Braun of Bonn University, Baltzer and Ritter of Breslau, and von Spiegel, Archbishop of Cologne. Von Spiegel died in 1835, and Clement Augustus was appointed as his successor. His appointment brought matters to a crisis. The case, which had been already referred to Rome, was decided against the supporters of Hermes, and by two decrees, in 1835 and in 1836, the works of Hermes were placed upon the Index. Braun and Elvenich undertook a journey to Rome in 1837 to secure a revision of this sentence, but their efforts failed, and on their return to Germany many of the Herme-

sians accepted the decision. On the publication of the Encyclical, *Qui pluribus abhinc annis,* which laid down the relations between Faith and Reason, many of the followers of Hermes proclaimed that the doctrine of their master was in complete harmony with the teaching of the Pope. Pius IX. was obliged to issue a new condemnation of the Hermesian doctrine. During the stormy years, 1848 and 1849, the Hermesian party practically disappeared. Achterfeld and Braun alone held out, but in 1860 they, too, accepted the condemnation, and died in peace with the Church.

Günther (1783-1863), a secular priest living in Vienna, belongs to the same school of rationalistic Catholic theologians. Believing that the criticism of Kant had destroyed the traditional Christian philosophy, he set himself to the task of recasting the revealed doctrines so as to bring them into harmony with sound philosophy. He undertook to supply philosophic explanations and defences of the Catholic dogmas and mysteries, and, as might be expected, his explanations of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the supernatural state, grace, creation, &c., were entirely out of harmony with the traditional beliefs of the Catholic Church. Günther admitted this fact, but defended himself by pointing out that the definitions of the Church were only of a provisional character, that they underwent changes according to the wants of any particular epoch, and that with the development of philosophy they might be understood in a sense which is entirely novel, or even contrary to that which the entire body of the faithful previously held. Hence, Günther was led to deny in fact, if not in theory, the immutability of revealed truth, and the absolute infallibility of the definitions of the Church.

His theories were attacked by Clemens, Dieringer, and Kleutgen, while they were defended by Baltzer of Breslau, and Hilgers and Knoodt of Bonn. The question was carried to Rome, and Baltzer and Knoodt went there to defend their views, but after an examination, lasting over five years, the writings of Günther were

placed upon the Index (1857). Günther himself immediately submitted, and died in peace with the Church in 1863. All his followers, however, did not imitate his example. Professor Baltzer was the most stubborn. He, too, was condemned by Pius IX. in 1860.

Professor Froschammer (1821-1883) of Munich was another member of the same party. Condemned in 1857 on account of certain doctrines, he refused to submit to the decision on the ground that philosophy as such was independent of the Church, though, at the same time, he contended that philosophy could furnish an absolute proof of the doctrines and mysteries of Christianity. His theories were condemned by Pius IX. in 1857, but the professor was stubborn in his refusal to accept the decree. Later on he joined the sect of the Old Catholics.

Of a somewhat different character was the movement begun by a suspended priest named Ronge in 1844. In that year the exposition of the Holy Coat of Treves for the veneration of the faithful brought immense numbers of pilgrims from all parts of Germany to the city. Ronge, who had most of the qualities requisite for a successful demagogue, issued a proclamation against superstition, and called upon German Catholics to join in purifying German Catholicism. The Protestant papers gave him every support. Ronge was hailed as another Luther, and, like Luther, he continued to issue his appeals to all classes of the people. Several priests and people joined him, and soon communities of his followers began to be formed under the title of German Catholics or Christian Catholics. A council, the first general council of the German Catholics, as it was called, was held in Leipzig in 1845. A formula of belief and an ecclesiastical organisation, borrowed principally from the Protestant Church, were adopted. Ronge himself undertook a campaign through the country, and succeeded in winning over a large following of Protestants and Catholics. From 1844 till 1848 the movement assumed considerable

dimensions, but the stern opposition of the Catholic clergy, the attitude of hostility adopted by the governments, once they discovered that the sect was more of a political revolutionary than a religious body, and divisions amongst the followers of Ronge, led to its gradual decline after 1849. Instead of injuring the Catholic Church, it helped to bring about the great Catholic revival noticeable in Germany at that period.

Liberals and Conservatives

The alarming spread of rationalism and naturalism, the attacks upon the very foundations of revealed religion, the tendency toward secularism in the state and in education, and the development of new ideas on liberalism and democracy, could not fail to arouse the serious attention of Catholics. After the great Catholic revival following upon the Revolutions of 1831 and 1848 a keen observer might easily detect the presence of two schools of thought amongst the Catholics themselves. One party seemed to think that the best method of meeting the new dangers which threatened religion was to strengthen the central authority in the Church, namely, the Papacy; while others considered that the safety of religion lay in a frank recognition of the new spirit of the age, and a reconciliation with it, as far as such reconciliation was possible without a sacrifice of principles. Authority was the watchword of the Conservatives, liberty the rallying cry of the Liberals. In France the Conservative party was represented by such men as Mgr. Pie. Mgr. Parisis, Louis Veuillot, and their principal organ was *L'Univers*; the Liberals by Montalembert, Dupanloup, Falloux, de Broglie, &c., and their organ was *Le Correspondant*. In England, the same division was clearly noticeable. Wiseman, Manning, Ward, were on the one side with the *Dublin Review*, Acton, Simpson, &c., on the other side with the *Home and Foreign Review*. In Belgium, the sup-

porters of the constitution of 1831 as the ideal thing formed the Liberal party, the men who objected to the liberties of worship and of the press guaranteed by it, formed the Conservative party.

In Germany, a similar division of opinion existed, but the questions at issue were of a different kind. The divergence was most marked in the realms of philosophy and history. The Liberal party objected to the revival of scholastic philosophy, and advocated the freedom of philosophic and historical investigation from the control of theology or of ecclesiastical authority. The Conservatives urged the importance of returning to the system of philosophy which had been identified so long with Catholic teaching, and the necessity for controlling the conclusions of philosophy and history by the supreme teaching authority in the Church.

A crisis came at the Congress of Munich in 1863, when, on the invitation of Döllinger, Haneberg, and Alzog, German Catholic scholars, lay and clerical, met to discuss the best means of defending the interests of the Catholic Church. The congress opened in the Abbey of St. Boniface on the 28th September, 1863, and Döllinger, who was unanimously selected as its president, delivered one of his most powerful addresses. Though the congress was most respectful in its attitude towards the Pope, and though the division between the two parties was apparently settled, yet the declarations of the president about the absolute freedom of science, the denunciations of the low state of learning in the Latin countries, and the veiled attacks upon the Roman Congregations, naturally tended to give great offence. Pius IX. openly showed his disapproval of such assemblies in a letter addressed to the archbishop of Munich (21st Dec., 1863).

In the same year a great Catholic Congress was held at Mechlin. Montalembert was one of the principal orators, and his marked glorification of the four liberties guaranteed by the Belgian constitution, liberty of education, of association, of worship, and of the press,

together with his theory of "a free Church in a free state," was clearly a revival of the Liberalism of the school of de Lamennais, which had been condemned already by Gregory XVI.

Intervention of Authority

Between the Traditionalists on the one side, and the Rationalist theologians on the other, the Catholic Church steered a middle course. In his Encyclical, *Qui pluribus* (9th Nov., 1846), Pius IX. laid down against the Traditionalists that human reason must precede faith by establishing the certainty of the motives of credibility; while, against the school of Hermes, he maintained that reason having prepared the way for faith, the assent of faith was given not on account of the intellectual proofs, but on account of the authority of God the Revealer. The teaching of the Encyclical of 1846 was further developed and explained in the decrees of the Vatican Council.

The definition of the Immaculate Conception in 1854 marked a new stage in the history of the Roman See. Though the advice of the bishops of the world was sought, yet the decree was promulgated solely on the authority of the Pope, as the Supreme Head of the Church. Such a step, naturally, supposed the doctrine of Infallibility, and prepared the way for a formal definition of this doctrine. Nor was there any serious opposition in the Church either to the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception itself or to the mode by which it had been proclaimed, a fact which clearly emphasised the acceptance by the faithful generally of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility before the doctrine itself was formally defined. Ten years later another momentous step in the same direction was taken, when Pius IX. published the Syllabus of Errors, and the Bull, *Quanta Cura* (8th Dec., 1864). These documents were directed principally against rationalism, both in its extreme form

as advanced by those who did not accept the Christian revelation, and in its mild form as advocated by certain German scholars, as well as against indifferentism, socialism, and the current errors regarding the relation of Church and State, Christian marriage, the Roman Pontiff, and modern Liberalism.

It was only, however, at the Vatican Council in 1870 that the disputes which had divided Catholic theologians during the greater part of the century were definitely settled. In the *Constitutio Dogmatica de Fide Catholica* the relations between faith and reason were clearly defined. The exaggerations of the Traditionalists and of the German school were equally condemned, and the different provinces of faith and reason definitely determined. In the Dogmatic Constitution, *De Ecclesia Christi* (18th July, 1870) the doctrines about the Primacy and Infallibility of the Bishop of Rome, as successor of St. Peter, were solemnly promulgated. Thenceforth, Gallicanism and Febronianism were banished for ever from the Catholic schools. At the very moment when the temporal power of the Pope was about to be destroyed by the seizure of the last remnants of the Papal States, and even of the city of Rome, the supreme spiritual authority of the Pope was triumphantly proclaimed.

Later Developments

Since the Vatican Council the errors have been largely in the field of practical reform rather than of dogmatic teaching. The movement referred to as *Americanism* and the Catholic Reform movement in Germany did not deal directly with faith, but rather with the discipline of the Church. On the other hand, the system of Modernism, condemned by Pius X. in the decree, *Lamentabili* (3rd July, 1907), and in the Encyclical, *Pascendi dominici gregis* (8th Sept., 1907), was clearly a reaction against authority and in favour of individ-

ualism. In place of the motives of credibility usually put forward as a groundwork for Christian revelation, and of the external teaching authority of the Church, it endeavoured to set up the inner consciousness and experience of the individual as the basis and criterion of faith; and instead of regarding the Catholic dogmas as absolute and objective truths, it looked upon them merely as relative and varying formulas by which the individual endeavours to express the inner manifestations of the divinity. By confining human knowledge to the knowable or phenomenal world, and faith to the unknowable world, all possibility of a conflict between faith and reason, it was contended, was finally removed. This new form of error was solemnly condemned in the Syllabus (*Lamentabili,* July, 1907), and by the Encyclical *Pascendi dominici gregis* (Sept., 1907).

CHAPTER IX

ECCLESIASTICAL STUDIES IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Ecclesiastical Studies

Bellamy, *La Théologie Catholique au XIX^e Siècle*, Paris, 1904. Mignot, *Lettres sur les Etudes Ecclésiastiques*, Paris, 1908. Battifol, *Questions d'enseignment supérieur ecclésiastique*, Paris, 1907. Hurter, *Nomenclator Litterarius*, 1764-1894, 2 ed., Innsbruck, 1907. Péchenard, *De l'Education au XIX^e Siècle* (Rev. du Clergé Français Jan., 1900). Sertillanges, *La situation présente du Catholicisme en France au point de vue intellectuel* (Rev. Thomiste, 1902). Hogan, *Clerical Studies*, Boston, 1898. Slater, *A Short History of Moral Theology*, New York, 1909. Perrier, *The Revival of Scholastic Philosophy*, Colombia Univ. Press, 1909.

The state of ecclesiastical science at the beginning of the nineteenth century could hardly be described as flourishing. At a time when the Catholic Church was face to face with an exceedingly brilliant band of opponents, it was particularly unfortunate that the clergy showed such little zeal or ability in its defence. Were it not for such laymen as Chateaubriand, de Maistre, Schlegel, Stolberg, and Görres, the rationalist and irreligious writers might have secured a monopoly in the field of literature. The causes that produced such a decline of learning amongst the clergy are obvious to anyone acquainted with the period. The suppression of the Jesuits and of the other religious orders during the French Revolution, the destruction of the seminaries and universities during the same period, the baneful influence of Jansenism, Gallicanism and Josephism, together with the low state of religious feeling which had become general in the

Church, are sufficient to account for the sad plight of ecclesiastical education at the beginning of the last century. Besides, the clergy, especially in France and Germany, had broken with the philosophy of the Middle Ages, without having been able to substitute some other systems in its place. Outside the ranks of the Benedictines history was to a great extent neglected; while the traditional views regarding the meaning, value, and origin of the Scriptures were regarded as being beyond the pale of criticism.

No wonder that earnest men were thoroughly alarmed at the condition of ecclesiastical education. The enemies of the Church had captured in great part the educational machinery. Securely entrenched in the universities, they bade fair to reduce Catholicity to the position of a mere peasant religion. Their anti-Christian philosophy had become the current philosophy in the seats of learning, the cultivation of the Oriental languages and of biblical criticism was almost entirely in their hands, as was also the study of patrology, ecclesiastical history, and archaeology; while, at the same time, the ecclesiastical seminaries were plodding their way, depending for the education of their students on a few antiquated text-books, and regardless of the serious dangers created by the rapid advance of the secular sciences. German science was a bye-word in France till the results of such science were brought home to the clergy with stunning force by the publication of such works as Renan's *Life of Christ*.

It was in philosophy, scripture, and history that the real source of danger to the Church was to be sought; and hence it is in these branches especially that the great progress made in ecclesiastical sciences during the century is especially noticeable. The philosophic theories of Kant, Fichte and Hegel had been applied in such a way to the foundations of the Christian Revelation as to destroy apparently all motives of credibility and to deprive faith of any rational and certain basis. It is interesting to note that while one party in the Church sought safety from

such attacks by entrenching themselves behind Traditionalism and Ontologism the German school endeavoured to effect a compromise between Christianity and modern philosophy. Very few thought of having recourse to the system of philosophy which for centuries had been identified with the defence and exposition of Christian dogma, namely, the scholastic philosophy, which had fallen into neglect in France and Germany since the middle of the eighteenth century. Yet it is the revival of Scholasticism, or, rather, the Neo-Scholastic movement which is the most notable feature in the Catholic philosophic movement in the nineteenth century.

In Italy, the leading men in this movement were Sanseverino (1811-1865), Liberatore (1810-1892), and Cornoldi (1822-1892); in Germany, Clemens (1815-1862), Stöckl, famous for his *Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters* (1864-66), and Kleutgen (1811-1883); and in Spain, Balmes (1810-1848), and Gonzalez (1831-1892). Academies of St. Thomas had been founded at Naples, Perugia, and Bologna during the reign of Pius IX., but little serious effort was made to encourage the revival of Scholasticism till the accession of Leo XIII. (1878). Years before, Leo XIII. had noticed the hopeless attempts made in Italy, France, and Germany to reconcile modern philosophy with Christianity, and the condemnation by the Church to which such efforts usually led; and he had arrived at the conclusion that the best hopes for a perfect reconciliation lay in a return to the general principles of Scholastic Philosophy. These principles had already offered a secure basis for the defence and interpretation of the Catholic dogmas, and if in particular details the advances in the study of the natural sciences had demonstrated the untenableness of the position of the Scholastics, such details might be abandoned, or formulated in a style more in conformity with the latest results. It was not, then, a mere slavish adoption of Scholasticism that was advocated by Leo XIII. He wished that Catholic scholars should do what St.

Thomas himself would do were he alive, namely, to test and establish these principles by the proved conclusions of natural science, and to modify them if, in particulars, they were found defective.

In 1879 he published the Encyclical, *Aeterni Patris*, recommending the re-introduction of Scholastic philosophy into the Catholic schools. Nor did he stop with the publication of the Encyclical. Palmieri, who had succeeded Tongiorgi, and Coretti, both of whom were hostile, were removed from their chairs. Cornoldi, the great defender of Scholasticism, was appointed professor at the Roman College, Zigliara at the Minerva, Satolli and Lorenzelli at the Propaganda, and Talamo at the Apollinare. An Academy of St. Thomas was founded at Rome, and orders were given by the Pope for the preparation of a new edition of the works of St. Thomas. Since that time Scholastic philosophy has reigned supreme in the Roman colleges and universities.

The Pope naturally turned to Belgium for co-operation in this work. From his knowledge of the country, acquired during his residence as nuncio in Brussels, he was well aware of the great influence of the University of Louvain, and the advantages to be derived from securing its assistance. In 1880, he requested Cardinal Dechamps to establish a chair of Scholastic philosophy at Louvain. The request was immediately complied with, and Mgr. Mercier, now Cardinal Mercier, Archbishop of Mechlin, was appointed the first professor. In 1888, the Pope suggested the idea of establishing a special Institute for the study of Scholastic philosophy, and contributed a large sum of money to meet the necessary expenses. The Institute was opened in 1891. Since that date Louvain has really became the centre of the Neo-Scholastic movement. In addition to the study of Scholasticism in its sources, modern philosophy and the experimental sciences receive due attention; and, as a result, the work at Louvain has arrested the attention of earnest men. Catholic scholars have been sent from nearly all countries to study at the Louvain

Philosophical Institute, and the *Cours de Philosophie,* published by Mgr. Mercier with the co-operation of such men as de Wulf, Nys, and others, offers the best exposition of the Neo-Scholastic system that has yet been attempted.

In Germany, the *Philosophia Lacensis,* published by Pesch, Hontheim, and Meyer, the works of Cathrein and Gutberlet, the series of unpublished scholastic works, edited by Bäumker, professor in Strassburg, and the Baron von Hertling, under the title of *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters,* and such periodicals as the *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* (since 1888), *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und Speculative Theologie* (since 1887), are indications of the progress of the Neo-Scholastic movement. In France, the great representatives of the school are the Count de Vorges, the Sulpicians, Vallet, Farges, Bulliat, the Marists, Peillaube and Ragey, and the professors, Blanc (Lyons), Didiot (Lille), and Besse (Paris). In Spain, the most conspicuous defender of Scholasticism is Urráburu (*Institutiones Philosophicae,* 8 vols., 1890); in Portugal, Sinibaldi; and in Hungary, Pécsi, professor in the seminary, Esztergom. The *Stonyhurst Philosophical Series,* published by Clarke, Rickaby, Boedder, and Maher, offers the best exposition of Scholasticism that has been published in English.

Scripture

The early Reformers, in their anxiety to balance the Infallibility of the Bible against the Infallibility of the Church, were never weary of affirming the divine origin and inspiration of the Scriptures. But from the middle of the eighteenth century an alarming reaction set in which threatened to destroy entirely the authority of the Bible. The forerunners of the modern school of Higher Critics, Richard Simon (1638-1712), Astruc (1684-1766) and Geddes, who were Catholics; and the Protestants

Eichorn, Lessing (1729-1781), and Semler, did not themselves influence the great body of believers, but they prepared the way for the general attack which was opened on the Scriptures during the nineteenth century.

For a long time in Catholic schools the voice of tradition and of authority was regarded as a sufficient proof of the authenticity and inspiration of any particular book. The internal arguments and the difficulties that might be drawn from the books themselves, or from the secular sciences, did not meet with the attention they deserved. To a certain extent the same held true of the non-Catholic biblical scholars. But, during the nineteenth century, another class of critics arose, the so-called Higher Critics, who started from the principle that the Scriptures should be tested like any other literary or historical record, not so much by external authority or tradition, as by the internal evidence regarding the date and authorship and circumstances of writing afforded by the text itself. They relied mainly upon literary, philological, historical, and scientific arguments, by means of which they impugned the commonly accepted notions about the authorship, date, value, and inspiration of the books, both of the Old Testament and of the New. The development in the study of the Oriental languages, philology, history, and archæology, and the discoveries in geology and the kindred sciences, the great progress made in recent times in regard to literary and historical criticism, and the prevalence of a materialistic conception of history, have been the chief causes of the furious war that has been waged against the Scriptures in the nineteenth century.

The war was begun by de Wette in 1805, and was carried on by Bleek, Ewald, Kuenen, Reuss, Graf, and Wellhausen. As a rule, these writers confined their attention to the books of the Old Testament, but the same principles were also applied, and with similar results, to the New Testament, and more especially to the Gospels. The groundwork of the system as directed

against the Gospels was undoubtedly to a great extent philosophical. Semler, Paulus, Eichorn, and Lessing took a leading part in the attack upon the New Testament, but the man who first really applied the new materialistic canons of historical criticism to the Gospels was Strauss. In his *Life of Christ*, published in 1835, he rejected all that was supernatural or miraculous in the Gospel narrative, and painted Christ merely as a clever Jewish leader. In later years Renan, in his *Vie de Jésus* (1863), aimed at doing for France what Strauss had already done for Germany. After Strauss, the best known of the German Higher Critics, is Baur, the founder of the Tübingen School. According to him, the New Testament was the result of a conflict and a compromise between two parties in the early Church, the Petrines or Jewish section, and the Paulines or Gentile party. Though the conclusions of these writers have met with no general acceptance, and though in many quarters a strong conservative reaction is clearly noticeable, yet the principles laid down by them have utterly discredited the Protestant position in regard to the Bible, and have gone a good way to shake the beliefs of the non-Catholic scholars in regard to its origin, authority, and inspiration.

Unfortunately, in Catholic schools the Higher Criticism movement did not attract at first the attention it deserved. Catholics felt themselves safe in relying upon the authority of the Church, and neglected to adopt the precautions which the critical situation required. Outside Germany the Oriental languages were to a great extent neglected, the archæological finds were disregarded, the assertions of geologists passed over lightly, and the whole theories of Higher Criticism good humouredly referred to as the latest fad of German scientists. In Germany itself, Catholic scholars, like Isenbiehl (+ 1818), Jahn (+ 1816), Mayer (+ 1820), and Ackermann, endeavoured to fight the new school with their own weapons, but in some cases they were led into positions which were hardly less extreme than those

taken up by their opponents. Hug (+1846), a professor in Freiburg, and the author of an *Introduction to the New Testament*, was an earnest defender of the Catholic position, as were also Scholz (+1852), Herbst (+1836), and Welte.

In France, owing partly to the disorganisation that followed the Revolution, Scriptural developments were not watched with due attention. The ablest of the Catholic professors were Garnier, Glaire, and Le Hir, Saint Sulpice. These men adopted the proper methods, but their example was not followed. It was only when the French translation of the *Leben Jesu*, by Littré (1839), the foundation of the *Revue Germanique* (1858), and the publication of the *Vie de Jésus*, in 1863, had brought home to the clergy the real danger of the German theories, that the ecclesiastical colleges began to interest themselves in the Higher Criticism. It was found necessary to examine more closely the arguments in favour of the historical authority of the Scriptures, and more especially the arguments in favour of the authority of the four Gospels. The danger was that in their new zeal for the new methods, Catholic scholars might be carried to the other extreme, but fortunately at this period the Vatican Council interfered in the question of the Scriptures, and re-stated the position of the Catholic Church. It was laid down that the books of the Old and New Testament, as enumerated by the Council of Trent, were to be received as sacred and canonical; furthermore, that these books were divinely inspired in the sense that they were written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and have God as their author (Cap. II. 4).

This definition still left a wide field open to Catholic scholars for free investigation. The question of the human authorship, the unity of composition, the dates of the different books, and the extent of the inspiration of the sacred writings, were still to be examined in the light of sane criticism, and with due regard to the infallible authority of the Church. Some authors, *e.g.*,

Le Noir, Langen, Reusch, had previously suggested the possibility of errors in the Scriptures, especially on questions not bearing directly on faith and morals, and even after the Vatican Council, Lenormant took up that position in his book, *Les Origines de l'histoire d'après la Bible, &c.*, 1880, in which he distinctly asserted that inspiration extended only to the statements bearing on religion in the text, but his work was condemned by the Congregation of the Index. Cardinal Newman suggested the non-inspiration of the *obiter dicta* portion of the Scriptures (1884), and Bartolo and Didiot seemed to insist that in regard to questions not bearing directly or indirectly on faith or morals, the divine inspiration given to the authors was of such a kind as did not exclude the possibility of error. Bartolo's book was put on the Index in 1891. Mgr. D'Hulst, rector of the Catholic Institute at Paris, advanced the same thesis in a pamphlet entitled *La Question Biblique,* published in the *Correspondant,* 1893. These views were combated by the vast body of theologians, who strongly maintained the inerrancy of the Scriptures; and so warm was the controversy that the Holy See determined to interfere. In November, 1893, Leo XIII. published the Encyclical, *Providentissimus Deus,* in which he laid down the absolute inerrancy of the sacred writings, and condemned the views of those who limited inspiration to certain parts of the Scriptures, or who asserted that the inspired authors erred in their statements. Since that time the inerrancy of the Scriptures has been accepted by Catholic scholars, but has been explained in very different senses. Even though it were impossible to admit that the inspired writers erred in the moral or religious instruction which they gave or in the historical facts which they positively affirmed, it still remained to be decided what precisely the writers wished to assert, what style of language or of literary composition they adopted, and whether they had not recourse to the popular phraseology, metaphors, literary figures, and methods adopted by profane writers of the same period.

The Catholic Church has not expressed a definite opinion upon the date or the authorship of the sacred books, or upon the human sources from which the writers drew their information, or upon the style of literary composition which they adopted. These are questions to be examined by the expert critics under the guidance of the teaching and authority of the Church. In order to regulate the discussion of such questions by Catholic scholars in a manner conformable to the teaching of the Encyclical, *Providentissimus Deus,* Leo XIII. established a Biblical Commission in Rome, consisting of a number of experts selected from the different countries (1902). Pius X. has given to this body the power of conferring degrees upon students of the Sacred Scripture, and arrangements are being made at present for the establishment of a special Scriptural Institute at Rome.

For the last thirty years wonderful activity has been displayed by Catholic scholars in the study of the Scriptures, both in subjects relating to the date, authenticity, and value of the books, and in the critical exegesis of the texts themselves. In the Jesuit College at Beirut students are trained in the Oriental languages, and in the school established at Jerusalem by the Dominicans, under the direction of Père Lagrange, an opportunity is given to young ecclesiastics of acquiring a knowledge of the methods of scientific criticism, and of the studies which help to throw light on the value or meaning of the Scriptures. Père Lagrange also established the *Revue Biblique Internationale,* which is the leading Catholic Scriptural review. The *Biblische Zeitschrift* is supported mainly by German scholars. Notable publications are also the *Cursus Sacrae Scripturae*, undertaken by the Jesuits, Cornely, Knabenbaur, and Hummelauer, and the Biblical Studies Series (*Biblische Studien*), carried out under the editorship of Professor Bardenhewer of Munich since 1896.

Ecclesiastical History

At the beginning of the nineteenth century ecclesiastical history was almost entirely neglected in most of the seminaries and colleges. The French Revolution had destroyed many of the great ecclesiastical libraries, and even amongst the Benedictines, remarkable at other times for their historical research, the break with the past was only too noticeable. But the nineteenth century witnessed a remarkable revival of historical studies, and a remarkable development in historical methods and criticism. This was due in great measure to the publication of the great national collections wherein were incorporated the works of the early and Middle Age writers, the giving to the world of the secrets of the government archives in the State papers, and the free access given by Leo XIII. for research in the Vatican archives.

In this great revival Catholic scholars have borne an honourable part, and the progress made within the last twenty-five years has shown that the exhortations of Leo XIII. have met with unexampled success. Nor has the activity of Catholic scholars been confined merely to general histories of the Church, such as those prepared by Rohrbacher, Darras, Receveur, Alzog, Hergenröther, Kraus, Palma, Jungmann, &c. Special departments and special periods have been thoroughly investigated. Naturally enough, the early centuries of the Christian era have been the subject of special investigation by Catholic and non-Catholic writers. The men who wished to prove that Christianity was only a development of Judaism and Roman paganism, and those who thought they saw in the modern Catholic Church a great departure from the beliefs and practices of the apostolic age, turned to the sources of information upon the period; while Catholic writers naturally turned to the same authorities for a confirmation of the doctrine and discipline of their Church.

Hence, the Patristic period has been a special subject for historical research. By the monumental work done by the Abbé Migne and his associates in the publication of the Greek and Latin Writers (379 volumes, Paris, 1843 *sqq.*), the way was opened for a thorough study of the Patristic and Middle Age ecclesiastical literature. Besides the work of the Abbé Migne, Catholics may point with pride to the editions of Cardinal Mai (*Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio,* 10 vols., 1825-1838; *Spicilegium Romanum,* 10 vols., 1839-1844; *SS. Patrum Nova Bibliotheca,* 1852-1888), of Pitra (*Spicilegium Solesmense,* 4 vols., 1852-1858, *Analecta Sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi parata,* 4 vols., 1867-1883, and the *Analecta Novissima,* 2 vols., 1885-1888), to the critical edition of the Apostolic Fathers by Funk, the edition of the Syriac Fathers begun by Graffin and Nau in Paris in 1894, and the various texts published by the Benedictines in the *Anecdota Maredsolana* (from Maredsous in Belgium), the *Spicilegium Casinense,* and the *Bibliotheca Casinensis* (from the Monastery of Monte Cassino). Besides these, various collections of the Fathers for the use of students have been published, *e.g.,* by Hurter at Innsbruck, by Hemmer and Lejay in Paris, and in the *Bibliotheca Sanctorum Patrum,* Rome. For the study of the Patristic period and literature notable books have been published by Fessler, Jungmann, Funk, Battifol, Bardenhewer, and Ehrard.

Besides the early literature, the ancient inscriptions and monuments were of invaluable importance in the critical study of the period. Naturally enough, the Roman inscriptions and the catacombs deserved special attention; and, fortunately, Catholic scholars like De Rossi, Garrucci, Wilpert, Waal, Marucchi, have taken the leading part in giving to the world the evidences furnished by the Roman monuments and inscriptions. The immense value of the service done by de Rossi (1822-1892) to the Church in his publication of the Roman Inscriptions (1857-1877), and the *Roma Sotterranea* (1864-1877), and in the *Bullettino de Archeologia*

Cristiana, 1863 *sqq.*, can hardly be exaggerated. By his ability and research, and with the generous patronage of Pius IX. and Leo XIII., he opened up a new world to the students of early Christian history. What de Rossi did for the Roman inscriptions has been done for the Christian inscriptions of France by Le Blant, of Spain by Hübner, and of the Rhinelands by Kraus, professor of history at Freiburg. Amongst the most noted students of this period of ecclesiastical history may be reckoned Möhler, Döllinger, Funk, Duchesne, and Battifol.

For the elucidation of the history of the Papacy very valuable sources of information have been given to the public. For the early centuries of the Church, the critical edition of the *Liber Pontificalis* (1886-1892) is indispensable. The continuation of the *Bullarium Romanum* by Spetia and Segreti (19 vols., 1835-1837), and the new edition (1857-1885) contains many of the important Papal pronouncements, while for the Middle Age Popes the Papal *Regesta,* published by Jaffé and Potthast, and brought down to the year 1304, and the Registers of the Popes of the thirteenth century, published by the *École Française* in Rome, furnish students with new and abundant materials. The numerous collections of Papal documents published by A. Theiner, illustrating the history of Hungary, of Poland, and of Ireland, are indispensable for a student of the history of these countries. The history of the Popes of the Middle Ages is being continued by Dr. Pastor.

For the history of the Councils of the Church, Catholic scholars have contributed very important material during the last century. In addition to the local publications, the new edition of the valuable collection of Councils by Mansi, the works done by Theiner, Döllinger, and the *Görresgesellschaft* for the Council of Trent, the *Collectio Lacensis,* published by the Jesuits, and containing the acts of the provincial and national synods held in the years between Trent and the Vatican, are of great value. The *History of the Councils,* written

by Hefele, is regarded by all parties as a monument of scholarly criticism and research.

On the Reformation period the works of Döllinger, Janssen, Gasquet, and Denifle, have revolutionised men's notions of the great rebellion of the sixteenth century, and have helped to lay bare the true causes of the unfortunate disruption of Western Christianity. By so doing, they have removed many grounds of possible misunderstanding, and have led both sides to take a more charitable view of the attitude of individuals and parties at the period of the Reformation. In Belgium, the Bollandists continue their work upon the history of the Saints. The volumes of the *Acta Sanctorum* were reprinted, and the work has been continued up till the month of November. Besides, their organ, *Acta Bollandiana* (since 1882) contains a large number of unpublished Lives of the Saints and other documents bearing on the same subject, together with critical dissertations on the sources of Hagiology, worthy of the best days of the Bollandists. In addition to these works of a general character, Catholics have paid great attention to the study of the institutions and history of particular countries and districts, but space does not permit a treatment of that subject.

It is not alone, however, by the quantity of the work done so much as by the quality that Catholic progress can be estimated. All that is latest and best in historical methods and criticism has been assimilated, and turned to the defence of the Catholic position. Special schools of historical method and research are in existence at many of the German universities, notably at Munich and at the Catholic University of Louvain; societies for the study of history and archæology have been established in Germany, France, Italy, England, and America; reviews dealing with ecclesiastical history or archæology have been established, of which the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique,* published from Louvain, is, perhaps, the most widely read and best.

Apologetics

The science of Apologetics has become more and more important during the past one hundred years. The contempt for authority and tradition, the freedom accorded by the civil authorities to the opponents of religion, and the enormous progress in the human sciences, have produced a host of critics anxious to call into doubt and to disprove almost every principle that had been accepted hitherto without dispute. From philosophy, from the Oriental studies, from history, and from the natural sciences, new objections have been urged with every show of learning against the Christian or Catholic position. Hence, the apologists have been obliged to have recourse to new methods of defence, to follow their opponents into each department of research, to sift out the truths that can be proved, and to show that these truths are not in contradiction to the principles of Christianity and the dogmas of the Catholic Church.

In the early years of the century apologists, like Chateaubriand, de Maistre, Schlegel, endeavoured to win men back to religion by painting the beauties of the Catholic religion, its triumphs during the centuries, its perfect harmony with all that is best in man, its social, literary, and artistic value, and its necessity as a groundwork for social and political life. Such a defence of Christianity, however suitable it was for the peculiar circumstances of the time, and however successful in winning back the multitudes on whom religion had lost much of its influence, was not calculated to satisfy the wants of the educated classes affected by the rationalistic principles of the eighteenth century.

Hence, men like de Lamennais, de Bonald, Bautain, and the others of the Traditionalist school, adopted a new method of defence, but by denying the power of human reason to establish the motives of credibility they sapped the very foundations of the structure they wished

to defend, and their doctrines were promptly rejected by the Church. On the other hand, the German school endeavoured to reconcile faith and reason by undertaking to explain and defend even the mysteries of religion independently of revelation; but their attempt led merely to a new form of religious rationalism, equally abhorred by the Church. Hence, nothing remained but to return once more to the principles of Scholastic philosophy, and by means of these principles to re-assert the rational basis of the Christian faith. This policy, which had been recommended by Pius IX., was finally insisted upon by Leo XIII. In France, however, where in the early years of the century Cartesianism and Traditionalism found zealous supporters, the Neo-Scholastic movement was not universally accepted. The supporters of the Neo-Kantian school of philosophy levelled against Scholasticism the charge of relying entirely on the merely intellectual motives of credibility, and of not appealing to men's hearts. Instead of the old arguments drawn from miracles and prophecy, which many of them claimed to be worthless, they endeavoured to prove the divinity of the Christian religion by showing its perfect harmony with the desires and aspirations of the human heart. This new school of Apologetics, known as the Immanentist school, pushed their conclusions to extremes, and, as a consequence, have been very seriously affected by the Syllabus, and the Encyclical, *Pascendi dominici gregis*.

In the defence of Christianity against the arguments drawn from the study of the Oriental languages, literature, and archaeological remains, the principal scholars on the Catholic side have been Jahn, Ackermann, Hug, Gainet, Vigouroux, Lagrange, and Scheil; while against the objections drawn from the natural sciences, geology, astronomy, and biology, the best known writers are Wiseman, Molloy, Guibert, and Lapparent. Against the theories of the Higher Critics as applied to the New Testament by men like Baur and his followers of the Tübingen school good work was done by Kuhn,

Döllinger, Sepp, and Hug, &c.; and, as a set-off to the Lives of Christ written by Strauss and Renan Catholics may point with pride to the works of Fouard, Didon, and Coleridge.

In another direction very serious difficulties have been urged against Christianity as a divinely revealed religion, namely, from the comparative study of religions. The principles of a materialistic evolution have been transferred from the physical to the religious world. It is contended that in religion there has been a steady progress from the more imperfect to the less imperfect forms, and that Christianity is only the latest development of the religious evolution. Such a theory, supported by the analogy drawn from the material world, and by the points of similarity common to all forms of religion is particularly insidious, and demands the most careful attention of Christian apologists. Very able Catholic writers in this field of research are Döllinger, the Abbé de Broglie, Mgr. Le Roy, and Mgr. de Harlez.

In France, the most remarkable Catholic apologists of the last century were Chateaubriand, De Maistre, Frayssinous, Lacordaire, de Ravignan, Monsabré; in Germany, Hettinger, Schanz, Schwetz, and Weiss; in Spain, Balmes and Donoso Cortes; in England, Milner, Wiseman, Newman, and Manning; and in Ireland, Doyle, MacHale, and Murray.

Dogmatic Theology

The causes that led to a decline in other branches of ecclesiastical learning produced a similar effect in the case of dogmatic theology. The break with the Scholastic system that had become almost complete in many countries at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the spread of Jansenism, Josephism, and the *Aufklärung*, and the neglect of biblical and historical research would be in themselves, independently of the disturbed political

conditions and the destruction of the universities and seminaries, sufficient to account for the low condition of theological science at the period. The style of text-books used on this subject in most of the ecclesiastical establishments were entirely antiquated, and took no notice of the new and dangerous tendencies that had manifested themselves since these books were written.

During the century two remarkable developments in theological science deserve to be specially noted. The first of these is the adoption of the historical method in the treatment of dogmatic theology, and the second, the return to the philosophic-theological system of the great scholastic doctors. Owing to the advance of historical criticism and research, and the appliance of historical methods to the study of the early centuries of Christianity, Catholic theologians were obliged to give much more attention to positive theology, to examine more critically the sources of the tradition upon which they relied, to draw new arguments from the archæological and literary discoveries, and to defend themselves against the attacks which were based upon such research. So remarkable has this tendency towards historical treatment of theology became in recent years, and so important are the historical defences of Christianity and Catholicity which have been published, that one might fairly compare this new alliance between theology and history in the nineteenth century to that effected between theology and philosophy in the early days of the Scholastics.

Möhler (1796-1838) may well be regarded as the founder of the historical school of theology in the nineteenth century. In his *Symbolik,* published first in 1832, he transferred the controversies with the different sects of Protestants to an entirely new ground, by returning to the works of the early Fathers, and by comparing the statements of the Fathers with the creed of the Catholic Church and the creeds of the heretical sects. The book created a great sensation at the time. New editions were called for in Germany, and translations of

it appeared in different countries of Europe. The methods of Möhler were taken up and followed with success by Döllinger, Alzog, Hefele, and to some extent by Perrone and Passaglia, Other writers who have availed themselves largely of the historical methods and research are Klee, Liebermann, Knoll, Scheeben, Berlage, Hurter, Kenrick, Murray, Schwane, and Pesch.

As a result of the appliance of historical methods to theology two peculiarly important consequences have followed. The first of these is the closer examination of the doctrine of development in Catholic dogmas, and the second the investigation of the history of dogma in general, or of some particular dogmas of the Catholic Church. While no Catholic could admit such a development of dogma as would include a new revelation, or the admission of any change in the defined doctrines of the Church, yet a comparison of the beliefs of the Church at the present time with the writings of the earlier Fathers shows clearly enough that there has been great progress in the interpretation and exposition of the body of revelation given by Christ to his apostles. The Patristic studies of men like Möhler and Newman brought them face to face with facts which could not be explained otherwise; and hence it is that Newman devoted so much attention to this subject in his remarkable *Essay on Development*. To him belongs the honour of having revived the theory, which had been put forward by Vincent of Lerins, by St. Augustine, and by Petavius, but which had been more or less neglected by Catholic theologians till the revival of historical studies made such a method of defence absolutely imperative. The theory of development, as advocated by Newman, is very different from that put forward by Günther and his school, according to whom the defined doctrines of the Church may, owing to the progress of philosophy and science, be explained in a sense different from that in which the Church has always understood them. Hence it is that though the teaching of Günther was condemned by the Vatican Council, the theory of development has

been freely used by theologians like Franzelin, Scheeben, Mazzella, Vacant, &c.

Connected with this theory of development is the appearance of an entirely novel department of ecclesiastical literature, namely, that dealing with the history of dogma. The very name was regarded by many with distrust, but a better understanding of the meaning of the immutability of dogmas, a closer examination of the writings of the Fathers, and the dangers to be apprehended were this field of research abandoned to non-Catholics reconciled even the most conservative theologians to the new branch of theological studies. The first book written by a Catholic writer on the history of dogma was that published by Klee in 1837. Since that time several books have been given to the world on that subject, the most notable of which are those by Zobl, Schwane, Ginoulhiac, Tixeront, and Turmel. In addition to the works dealing with dogma in general, very many interesting studies have been published dealing with particular subjects, such as Penance, the Eucharist, the Trinity, the Discipline of the Secret, the Sacraments, the Hierarchy, and the attitude of the early Church towards the Blessed Virgin.

The revival of Scholastic philosophy led also to a revival of the Scholastic method of dealing with theological subjects. In Germany the revival afforded grounds for warm controversies between the friends and opponents of the Scholastic system. Between the Tübingen Catholic School, the principal representative of which was Kuhn, and the Neo-Scholastics, Clemens (Münster) and Schäzler (Freiburg), the discussion was carried on with considerable heat. The leading writers of the Neo-Scholastic theologians are Schrader, Kleutgen, Franzelin, Pesch, and Billot. Though commonly referred to as Neo-Scholastics, it is not meant to convey that they ignore the results or methods of historical criticism. It is by a happy blending of both the Scholastic and historical treatment that the best results are to be obtained.

The general result of Higher Criticism as applied to the Scriptures and to the early Christian sources, instead of being disastrous or harmful, as was confidently predicted, has been as a rule beneficial. It has forced writers to be more careful in their citations and proofs, to examine closely the original texts, to discuss their value and authenticity, and to study the context in which the particular passages upon which they rely occur for a proper explanation of their meaning. Under such tests a few of the old-time arguments may have disappeared, but their disappearance only serves to bring out the strength and completeness of those which remain.

Moral Theology

On the teaching of moral theology in the early portion of the nineteenth century Jansenism still exercised a considerable influence, not in the sense that a large number of the theological writers were Jansenists, but rather that the tendency towards the false strictness so characteristic of that school was only too prevalent in Catholic circles. Hence, it was that the introduction of the *Moral Theology* of St. Alphonsus into the French seminaries met with strong opposition, and could be effected only with great caution, and after the lapse of years. But, thanks mainly to the writers of the Society of Jesus, milder principles have prevailed, and the doctrines of the mercy and goodness of God, Who established the Sacraments for men's spiritual progress, have been better understood.

Owing to the spirit of the age it has been found necessary to devote more attention to the fundamental principles of Christian ethics, and to establish by intellectual arguments what had been assumed hitherto as unquestionable. The development, too, of sociological studies in the nineteenth century has opened up a new field of enquiry for moral theologians, and has raised

a host of new problems, which demand careful treatment. Catholic theologians were in a peculiarly advantageous position in dealing with such questions, especially in view of the attitude which the Church has always adopted towards the labouring classes, and of the directions given them by Leo XIII.

The principal writers on moral theology during the century are Gury, Scavini, Ballerini, Gousset, Frassinetti, Lehmkuhl, Crolly, Aertnys, Bouquillon, Sailer, Clement Marc, Tanquerey, Génicot and Noldin.

Liturgical Studies

Like other branches of ecclesiastical science, liturgical studies were in a very low condition at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The prevailing spirit of rationalism tended to inspire a contempt for liturgical ceremonies, and to produce a movement in favour of simplifying the ritual of the Church. This movement found great favour in Germany, where its ablest supporters were von Wessenberg, Werkmeister, Reichenberger, &c., but there, too, it found strong opposition both from the clergy and the laity.

One of the most remarkable liturgical developments of the century is the abolition of the local liturgies, and the almost universal adoption of the Roman liturgy. This movement was begun in France by the learned Abbot of Solesmes, Dom Guéranger, as a good means of combating Gallicanism, and from France it spread into all the European countries. In 1840, Dom Guéranger published the first volume of his great work, *Institutions Liturgiques*, and the remaining volumes were finished in 1851. About the same time he began *L'Année Liturgique*, nine volumes of which were finished before his death in 1875, and the remaining three were brought out by one of his Benedictine colleagues. Before his death he had the satisfaction of seeing the Roman liturgy introduced into most of the dioceses of France.

The provincial and national councils held in so many countries since the middle of the nineteenth century have strongly insisted on the necessity of conforming to the Roman liturgy.

The interest taken in historical studies produced their due effect on the study of liturgy. Scholars were deeply interested in the origin and development of the ceremonies of the Mass, and of the Sacraments, in the Christian festivals, and in the construction of the liturgical year. Even among the Protestant sects the deepest interest was displayed in such studies, especially in England, where the Ritualist controversies tended to give this subject an undue pre-eminence. The most noted historians of the liturgy are Dom Guéranger, Schmid, Lüft, Probst, Gautier, and Duchesne, while special subjects, such as the Mass, the Breviary, and the liturgical vestments, have been investigated by men like Kössing, Gihr, Walter, Bole, Battifol, and Pleitner. The most noted Rubricists of the century have been de Herdt, Martinucci, Gardellini, and Probst.

Church Music

In the beginning of the nineteenth century Church music, like the other branches of ecclesiastical science, was at a very low ebb. The true appreciation of the liturgy had disappeared, and the forms and expressions of the music of the church were modelled too closely upon the music of the theatres. Not even the genius of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven could effect a change in the prevailing tone, though the *Missa Solemnis* of Beethoven represents the highest level of religious concert music.

The reform of this sad state of affairs is due largely to King Louis I. of Bavaria. Under his patronage Kaspar Ett made a beginning by performing works of the classic period of vocal polyphony, the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and by composing in the style

of the older masters. He was ably assisted in his efforts by Aiblinger. But Ratisbon, and not Munich, was destined to be the centre from which proceeded the great musical reform movement of the century. Amongst the many men who were destined to make the Ratisbon school famous was Karl Proske, who, after his ordination, settled in Ratisbon, and, with the assistance of the bishop, Sailer, and of the king, devoted himself to the study of music. He collected the old musical compositions of the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, and by adequate performance of them secured for them public appreciation. Aided by the cathedral choir-master, Schrems, he succeeded in reviving the music of the masters of vocal polyphony, and of evolving that style of performance which is still the glory of Ratisbon. Another priest of Ratisbon, Franz Witt, supported the plans of Proske by founding the *Fliegende Blätter für katholische Kirchenmusik* (1866), and more especially by establishing the Society of St. Cecilia (1868); while Haberl, for a time cathedral choir-master at Ratisbon, devoted his attention to the study of musical manuscripts in the libraries of Italy, and edited twenty-two volumes of the complete edition of Palestrina's works, published by Messrs. Breitkopf and Haertel. By this publication, as well as by the editions of the works of Orlando di Lasso and Vittoria, and by the *Monuments of German Musical Art*, and the *Monuments of Austrian Musical Art*, material of great value for the study of the history of Catholic polyphonic Church music was rendered accessible. Haberl also founded a school at Ratisbon for the training of choir-masters, in which institution most of the men who were eminent as Catholic choir-masters in the last quarter of a century in Germany and outside of it received their training.

While Ratisbon was the main centre for the revival of the classic polyphony, efforts were also made in other places for a restoration of Plain Chant. From the sixteenth century various attempts had been made to "reform" the Plain Chant, but only about the

middle of the nineteenth century experts began to realise that the true reform lay in a return to the original style. The Benedictine monastery of Solesmes was the centre of this new movement. Dom Guéranger commissioned two of the monks, Dom Jausions and Dom Pothier, to study the question, and after the death of Dom Jausions, Dom Pothier published the results of their investigations in a work entitled *Les Melodies Grégoriennes* (1880). Three years later he published a Gradual, in which for the first time the version of the medieval manuscripts was unreservedly adopted. Meanwhile, the Congregation of Rites had also taken up the question of Gregorian Chant, and commissioned the publishing firm of Pustet in Ratisbon to re-print a Gradual printed in Rome in 1614-15. The Gradual was declared "authentic," and the Ratisbon firm received a thirty years' privilege for the publication of this form of Plain Chant. Owing to the authority of Rome, this edition was largely adopted in Germany, and the realisation of Dom Guéranger's idea considerably postponed. A certain amount of friction ensued between the advocates of the ancient historical form and of the official version, which continued until Pius X. decreed the return to the ancient "traditional" form.

In Ireland, the foundation of an "Irish Society of St. Cecilia," and of a monthly journal, *Lyra Ecclesiastica* (1878-93), the establishment of a special chair of Church Music in Maynooth (1888), the endowment at the Pro-Cathedral in Dublin of a choir to be trained specially in plain chant and classical polyphony, and the efforts made by the Commissioners of National Education to promote the teaching of music in the primary schools, have done much to facilitate the development of true ecclesiastical music.

CHAPTER X

ECCLESIASTICAL EDUCATION

In addition to the works cited in the previous chapter, *cf*:—Siebengartner, *Schriften und Einrichtungen zur Bildung der Geistlichen*, Freiburg, 1902. Kraus, *Uber das Studium der Theologie sonst und jetzt*, Freiburg, 1890. Smith, *Our Seminaries: An Essay on Clerical Training*, New York, 1896. Baudrillart, *Le Renouvellement Intellectuel du Clergé de France au XIX^e Siècle*, Paris, 1903. Holzhammer, *Die Bildung des Klerus*, Mayence, 1900. Heiner, *Theologische Fakultäten und Tridentinische Seminarien*, Paderborn, 1900. O'Dea, *Maynooth and the University Question*, Dublin, 1903.

The Revolution of 1789 overthrew the theological faculties in France, but it is doubtful if such a result were not rather a blessing than an injury to the Church. When Napoleon, in conjunction with Pius VII., undertook the work of re-organising religion in France, it was stipulated in the concordat (Art. 11) that each bishop was free to have a seminary in his diocese, but the government was under no obligation to supply the necessary funds. In these circumstances, the bishops should have been allowed control of the education given in the seminaries, but Napoleon was determined to keep education entirely in his own hands. Hence, in the Organic Articles (Section III., Art. 23-26) it was laid down that the bishops should be charged with the organisation of their seminaries, but that the rules should be submitted for the approval of the First Consul, that the professors in such establishments should sign the Gallican Declaration of 1682, and expound it in their classes, that the bishops should forward yearly a list of the students in their seminaries, and that they should ordain no student

until the ordination had been approved by the government.

The new seminaries aimed at providing clergy to fill the numerous vacancies in the French Church, but beyond that they had no further ambition. The professors were, as a body, men of no educational standing, and the students turned out by them were utterly powerless to defend the Church at such a critical period. The total insufficiency of the training given in French seminaries was recognised by the ablest churchmen in France, but the efforts made by Cardinal Fesch to secure at least one high-class clerical seminary in each province failed partly on account of the fear of government control partly on account of diocesan jealousy. Another plan of the cardinal for the improvement of clerical studies, namely, the establishment in the Chapter of St. Denis of a school of ecclesiastics devoted entirely to literary and theological research was rejected by the government.

By the decree of 1808 the university monopoly in education was organised. Faculties of theology were established in Paris, and in the provincial universities, but they were entirely subject to the state, and were utterly distrusted by the bishops and by the Pope. Nor, with a few exceptions, were their professors men of any note. The ecclesiastical seminaries, both theological and preparatory, were placed almost entirely under the control of the state. The decrees of 1828 made the position of the preparatory seminaries even more precarious. The writings of de Lamennais, even though some allowance must be made for his spirit of exaggeration, furnish a gloomy account of the state of education in the seminaries of France in his time, and their complete subjection to the authority of the Crown. Lamennais himself gathered together a school of distinguished ecclesiastics whose aim was the elevation of ecclesiastical studies, and the preparation of a school of theologians thoroughly versed in the secular sciences; but the unfortunate attitude adopted by *L'Avenir*, and the condem-

nation of Gregory XVI. utterly discredited such a scheme.

The French seminaries were entrusted in great part to the care of religious congregations. The Sulpicians had, in addition to St. Sulpice, about 23 of the seminaries, while the Lazarists, the Marists, and other bodies had control of numerous establishments. In the revival which followed the revolutions of 1831 and 1848 a great improvement was effected in the seminaries, but it is worthy of notice that when some French bishops undertook the work of improvement they were obliged to look to Germany for the training of their professors in scripture and ecclesiastical history, and to Italy for the theology and philosophy.* In 1853, a French seminary was founded at Rome.

The real revival of ecclesiastical studies in France came with the establishment of the Catholic Institutes. By the law of 1875 the university monopoly in higher education was abolished, and permission was given to open free universities or institutes. In 1875, Poitiers and Lille were opened, and in the following year Angers, Paris and Toulouse. Theological faculties were established in these institutions, and they received from the Pope power to confer theological degrees. By means of the Catholic Institutes a capable body of professors has been prepared for the diocesan seminaries, thorough scientific work has been done, and a school of men has arisen who, by their ability, training, and successful work, command the confidence of the Catholics, and the respect of their opponents. As a result of the establishment of the Catholic Institutes the Catholic faculty of theology disappeared from the University of Paris in 1885, when the funds for the establishment were eliminated from the budget. The decree of 1808 has not, however, been revoked, but in the present circumstances it is not likely that the French bishops will ever petition for its re-establishment.†

* Battifol, *Questions d'Enseignment Supérieur Ecclésiastique*, Paris, 1907.
† *L'Université de Paris*, 1900.

The laws against the religious congregations had a serious effect upon many of the French seminaries. By a circular of M. Combes in 1904 the bishops were ordered to dismiss the religious congregations from their seminaries, and to replace them by secular priests. Fortunately, the Catholic Institutes afforded the opportunity of securing a body of trained teachers capable of carrying on the work with every hope of success. The separation of Church and State in France has further increased the difficulty of maintaining the French seminaries, both theological and preparatory, but the generosity of the French Catholics will ensure the future of these establishments.

In Germany and Austria the Napoleonic wars, and the secularisation of the ecclesiastical property, destroyed many of the ecclesiastical establishments, and most of the distinctively Catholic universities. In the concordat concluded between the Holy See and the different states, it was agreed that the bishops should be free to establish diocesan seminaries, which should be under ecclesiastical control, but in many cases this agreement was not executed. Hence, during the century a struggle has been maintained between the seminaries and the universities, the government favouring the education of the ecclesiastical students in the theological faculties, many of the bishops, on the other hand, supporting the seminaries. At present, theological faculties exist at Bonn, Breslau, Freiburg, Tübingen, Munich, Münster, Strassburg, Würzburg, and the lyceum at Braunsberg. In Bavaria there are state lyceums at Freising, Dillingen, Passau, and Bamberg. Side by side with these are episcopal seminaries at Treves, Mayence, Metz, Eichstätt, Fulda, Posen, Culm, and Paderborn. As a rule, the ecclesiastical students attending the universities live in houses specially prepared for the purpose, and under strict disciplinary rules. In addition to this, in most of the dioceses where the students are trained at the university, there have been founded practical seminaries (*Priesterseminarien*), where the students must

reside at least one year before their ordination, and where they are trained in the practical work of the mission. Finally, in nearly all the dioceses, one or more preparatory seminaries have been established, where the boys preparing for the ecclesiastical state at the official gymnasia are obliged to reside during their course at these public schools.

In Austria, theological faculties are established in connection with the Universities of Vienna, Gratz, Innsbruck, Salzburg, Prague, Olmütz, Cracow, and Lemberg. By the concordat of 1855 (Art. 17) it was agreed that the bishops might establish seminaries according to the decrees of the Council of Trent, and that the government would supply the necessary funds. Hence, seminaries have been erected in most of the dioceses, and in some cases provincial seminaries have been opened. Besides the institution known as St. Augustine's in Vienna, and Santa Maria dell' Anima in Rome, furnish an opportunity for the higher training of a select body of the Austrian clergy. In Hungary, in addition to the seminaries, there is a faculty of theology at the University of Budapest, and another at Agram. The preparatory seminaries in Austria are supported by private contributions.

In Switzerland the position of the seminaries was often seriously endangered owing to the political and religious struggles of the nineteenth century. Though the erection of a seminary in Basle was guaranteed by the concordat of 1828, it was only in 1860 that the establishment could be opened, and, then, the institution was almost entirely under the cantonal authorities for the most part Protestant. Between 1870 and 1884, when the Kulturkampf raged in Switzerland, many of the preparatory seminaries and two of the theological institutions were closed. At the present time theological seminaries exist in all the dioceses except that of St. Gall, the theological students of which attend the University of Freiburg. There is, however, a seminary at St. Gall for the practical training of the clergy. The faculty of theology estab-

lished in the University of Freiburg in 1889 is in the hands of the Dominican Fathers, and is attended by a large number of students (182 in 1908).

In Belgium, Joseph II. sought to carry out his policy of liberalising the Church by establishing one of his central seminaries at Louvain, but the revolution of 1791 put an end to his schemes. The seminary was destroyed by the people. Under the rule of Holland (1815-1830) the question of clerical education was a source of much contention, but after the foundation of the present kingdom of Belgium all difficulties were removed. The bishops were free to establish theological and preparatory seminaries. The most famous of the Belgian seminaries is that at Mechlin. In addition, there is a theological faculty at the University of Louvain, where the ablest students are sent to finish their education. Many of the young priests attend the courses in philosophy, arts, and science at the university, so that, altogether, well over three hundred ecclesiastical students enjoy each year the benefits of higher education in Belgium. Preparatory colleges are established in the different dioceses, while, in addition, a Belgian college was established at Rome in 1844. In Holland, the seminaries have been established by the bishops, and are under their exclusive control, but the state grants an annual subsidy for their maintenance.

In Italy, Rome is naturally the centre of theological science. The occupation of Rome by the French forces during the days of the Republic and of the Napoleonic rule led to the destruction of most of the Roman seats of learning. But on the return of Pius VII. most of the universities and colleges were re-opened, and during the nineteenth century a large number of national colleges were established. The seizure of Rome by the Italian troops led to new confiscations. The famous *Collegium Romanum* of the Jesuits, and the Minerva, the great Dominican university, were taken over by the Italians, while the conversion of the funds of the Propaganda into Italian stock in 1884 seriously crippled the

resources of the Propaganda college. The most famous of the Roman universities at present is the Gregorian university, conducted by the Jesuit Fathers, and the *Collegium Urbanum,* or Propaganda College. It is in these institutions that the students of the national colleges for the most part receive their education.

Outside of Rome, most of the Italian dioceses had their own seminaries, and since the dioceses are as a rule very limited in extent and population, the seminaries were not particularly flourishing. But since the accession of Pius X. a serious effort has been made to raise the standard of ecclesiastical education. In the preparatory seminaries the same course is to be followed as in the state secondary schools. Eight years are to be spent in the courses of the gymnasium and the lyceum, one year in the study of the propædeutics, and four years in the study of theology. The theological course should embrace not alone dogmatic and moral theology, but also scripture, history, canon law, archæology, patrology, liturgy, Greek, and Hebrew.

In Spain, the wars which disturbed the country during the first half of the nineteenth century were disastrous for the ecclesiastical establishments, but according to the terms of the concordat concluded between the Holy See and Spain in 1851 (Art. 28), it was provided that seminaries should be established in each diocese in accordance with the Tridentine decrees. By a royal decree of 1852 the chairs of theology in the state universities were suppressed, while about the same time it was arranged that the four central seminaries which serve as leading centres for ecclesiastical studies in Spain, namely, Granada, Toledo, Valencia, and Salamanca, should have the right to confer degrees in canon law and theology. Later on chairs of theology were re-established in the state universities, but this arrangement was totally abolished in the revolution of 1868. At present, therefore, though many of the Spanish universities are still thoroughly Catholic, the education of the clergy is carried on exclusively in the seminaries.

In Portugal, owing to the confiscation of ecclesiastical property, and the total loss of the revenues appropriated to the maintenance of the seminaries, these institutions were closed entirely in 1832. In 1845, they were re-opened, but the selection of books, the determination of the number of students to be admitted, the course of studies, the appointment of professors, and the standard of examinations, were taken from the bishops and placed entirely in the hands of the state officials. The bishops objected to such arrangements, but it was only in 1883 that they succeeded in securing some control of their own seminaries. In addition to the seminaries a theological faculty exists in the University of Coimbra, and was attended by 53 students in 1905. Owing to the persistent efforts of Leo XIII. a Portuguese college was formally established in Rome in 1900.

The history of the establishments for clerical education in Ireland and Scotland has been already dealt with in the general history of these countries. In England, the overthrow of the colleges on the Continent during the Revolution wars led to the foundation of Ushaw, Oscott, and St. Edmund's College, Ware. The English College in Rome was re-opened, and in some of the dioceses seminaries have been established.

In the United States, seminaries have been erected in a great many of the dioceses, and several of them are controlled by the Sulpician Fathers. In addition to these a college for ecclesiastical students from the United States was opened at Rome in 1859, and another at Louvain in 1857. Very many of the American students still study at St. Sulpice in Paris, or at Innsbruck in the Tyrol. Since the establishment of the Catholic University at Washington, an opportunity has been given to the more promising among the younger clergy to pursue a higher course of theology, and to prepare themselves fittingly for positions in the diocesan or provincial seminaries.

CHAPTER XI

SOCIALISM

Winterer, *Le Socialisme Contemporain*, 4e éd. Paris, 1901. Rae *Contemporary Socialism*, London, 1908. Leroy-Beaulieu, *Le Collectivisme*, 5 éd., Paris, 1909. D'Haussonville, *Socialisme et Charité*, Paris, 1895. Kirkup, *A History of Socialism*, 3rd ed., London, 1906. Ming, *The Characteristics and the Religion of Modern Socialism*, New York, 1909. Félix, *Christianisme et Socialisme*, Paris, 1879. Sertillanges, *Socialisme et Christianisme*, Paris, 1907. Villiers, *The Socialist Movement in England*, London, 1908. Holyoake, *The History of Co-operation*, London, 1908. Stang, *Socialism and Christianity*, New York, 1905. Ballerini. *Analisi del Socialismo Contemporaneo*, Sienna, 1904. Wacker, *Entwicklung der Sozialdemokratie*, 1871-1898, Freiburg, 1903. Cathrein, *Socialism*, Freiburg, 1908.

One of the most remarkable developments of last century is the sharp struggle which arose between Capital and Labour, and which continued to grow in dimensions and in bitterness till at the present time the two parties stand ready for battle in most of the civilised countries of the world. Conflicts between the rich and the poor were not unknown in the history of the world, but these were only passing incidents, confined in their operation to some particular district, while the modern Labour war is waged by two permanently organised forces, and is international in its character. The world is in a sense divided into two hostile camps, that of the capitalists, or employers, and that of the labourers, or the employees, and it is precisely on account of its features of permanency and universality that the modern Labour movement differs from similar phenomena either of the early centuries or of the Middle Ages.

The reasons for such a remarkable development are not far to seek. They are partly economical, partly political and religious. Owing to the discoveries in science and the application of these discoveries to industry and commerce, the small manufacturers, unable to compete with the improved machinery, have been crushed out; and while the number of those depending upon labour is steadily increasing, the capital of the world is being gradually monopolised by a few individuals, who are forced by the unrestricted national and international competition to produce at the smallest possible cost. As a result, the employees must be content to accept a rate of wage which is barely sufficient for the maintenance of themselves and their families, and unless they combine together in self-defence they are entirely at the mercy of the capitalist ring. In former times, before the introduction of improved machinery, and before steamships and railways had provided easy means of transport, the labourers were in many cases the owners of the merchandise produced; the distribution of wealth was necessarily more even; competition between the different nations was almost unknown; and the great industrial centres, which are such a remarkable feature of modern economic development, were an impossibility. The progress of science has, however, revolutionised the conditions of production, but in doing so it has created a new problem, namely, the Labour problem, the solution of which has been, for so far, sought in vain by individuals and governments. Again, the French Revolution proclaimed the equality of all men, though equality was understood by the leaders of the revolution in a very peculiar sense. The middle classes, who reaped the fruits of the destruction of the feudal interests of the nobility, reserved the equality for themselves, and used the *Rights of Man* merely as a means of winning the lower classes to their side in the struggle against the nobility. But the masses of the people soon discovered the deception, and insisted on sharing the fruits of the victory which had been won by

their co-operation. They in turn attacked the *bourgeoisie* just as the *bourgeoisie* had attacked the higher classes; and the second revolution, that of 1848, was a really popular revolution. The lower classes asserted for themselves a voice in the government of the different nations, and as time went on concession after concession was made, till at the present day their votes are the dominant factors in the constitutions of most of the Cabinets of the world. Having won for themselves political equality, and having at their disposal the most decisive weapon in modern constitutional struggles, namely, the popular suffrage, it is not to be wondered at that they should go further, and insist upon social equality, and the limitations of the absolutist rule of the capitalists.

Finally, the prevalence of irreligious views and of antagonism to all forms of positive religion amongst the ruling classes, and in the universities and seats of learning, was bound to have its effect on the masses of the people. If men are taught to scoff at the existence of God, the immortality of the human soul, the doctrine of a future state in which the inequalities of the present life are repaired, if, in a word, they are led to believe that their sole object in this world should be to procure the maximum of pleasure and ease, it is not surprising that the working classes should rebel against their lot, and seek to secure for themselves a greater share in the wealth which their labours produce. Materialism and atheism were undoubtedly the basis for the system sketched by Marx, and go far to explain the success which the Socialist agitation achieved during the nineteenth century. Wherever religion has had a hold upon the people, there the Socialists' campaign has met with little success, and wherever the religious influence was weak, the Socialist programme of universal happiness and equality has rallied to its support the masses of the people.

In many respects Socialism is but the logical consequence of Liberalism, however much Liberals may

protest against such a close connection. It was Liberalism which has rendered most of the universities of the world centres for the propagation of atheism and infidelity. It was Liberalism which sought, and seeks, to drive religion from the schools and colleges, and to introduce in its place some vague species of moral instruction separated from all dogmatic beliefs, and unavailing as a deterrent of crime because deprived of divine sanction. It was this same Liberalism which first formulated the doctrine that the exchange value of merchandise is only the result of labour, and that has aimed at centralising all power in the hands of the state. It was Liberalism, too, that suppressed all the safeguards against unlimited competition, and left the workmen helpless at the mercy of employers, anxious to exploit their services in the accumulation of colossal fortunes. Socialism is, therefore, only Liberalism pushed to its logical conclusions.

Three distinct stages may be discerned in the progress of Socialism in the nineteenth century. The first of these extends from about the French Revolution till the year 1848, the second from about 1848 till the foundation of the International Association of Workmen by Karl Marx in 1864, and the third stage from 1864 till the present time. In the first period the theories put forward were vague and impractical in character, but contained the germs of modern systems. In the second period the question was dealt with scientifically from an economical, philosophic, and historical point of view, and definite principles were advanced by men like Lassalle and Marx, and in the third period the workingmen were organised into professional, national, and international associations, in order to force the recognition of these principles by the governments of the world.

The philosophic writings of the eighteenth century, and the proclamation of the equality of men by the French Revolution, prepared the way for modern Socialism; while the appropriation by the state of the ecclesiastical

property, and the abolition of the feudal rights, helped to weaken the sacredness of private ownership in the eyes of the masses Yet, on the whole, it is astonishing how little pure Socialism can be detected in the literature of the French Revolution. With the exception of Baboeuf (1764-1797), who wished for a republic where all men would be completely equal, and where the state should be the sole proprietor and distributor, no man of note raised the Socialist flag. The Directory dealt promptly with the conspiracy of Baboeuf by sending its organiser to the guillotine.

Saint Simon (1760-1825) was a man of great ability, education, and experience, but, though he recognised the magnitude of the labour problem, his suggestions were more theoretical than practical. He held that, as labour was the standard of value, the labouring classes should take the first place in society. But he did not venture to advocate directly the abolition of private ownership. Industry was to be promoted by free associations, directed by men of science, and under the patronage of the state. The old religious notions, with the exception of belief in God, were to be abolished, and their place taken by brotherly love. The followers of Saint Simon, notably Bazard and Enfantine, continued to expound their master's teaching, but their practical application of the doctrine of love did not meet with the approval either of the public or of the police authorities, and the sect broke up after the imprisonment of Enfantine. Charles Fourier (1772-1837), Étienne Cabet (1786-1856), Pierre Leroux (1798-1871), Louis Blanc (1811-1882), and Proudhon (1809-1865), in France, and Robert Owen in England, are amongst the most important of these modern utopian Socialist theorisers. Louis Blanc endeavoured to put an end to wild industrial competition by introducing national workshops maintained by the state, and in this way he hoped to crush out the individualist competition. The Revolution of 1848 favoured his design, but the success was only momentary, and the soldiers of General Cavaignac

crushed the attempted social revolution. Of all these men, however, Proudhon was the most thoroughgoing and the most radical in his views. He was an enemy of Christianity and Catholicity, an opponent of private property in every shape or form, a writer endowed with a virile and fascinating style, and a well-accomplished popular demagogue. His views are to be found principally in his books, *La Propriété c'est le Vol* (1840), *Le Système des contradictions économiques, ou philosophie de la Misère* (1846), and *De la Justice dans la Révolution et dans l'Église*. For him private property was robbery, all social inequality unjustifiable, and authority something that should be suppressed. Proudhon is the founder of the extreme school of Socialism, namely, that of the Anarchists.

The second stage of Socialism, when the doctrines assumed scientific form, had its centre in Germany rather than in England or France. Its principal exponents are Karl Rodbertus (1805-1875), Ferdinand Lassalle (1825-1864), and Karl Marx (1818-1883). Rodbertus, who was the first to give prominence to the theory that all merchandise is but the fruit of labour, and is to be valued only by the amount of labour expended in its production, laid down the main principles from which Marx constructed his system. Lassalle was the great idol of the German workmen, but was merely a popular demagogue, borrowing for the most part from the writings of Rodbertus and Marx. His so-called discovery of the Iron Law of wages, according to which wages in present economic conditions can never far exceed what is barely necessary for the mere sustenance of the wage-earners, is deserted by most Socialists of the present time. The real founder of modern Socialism is Karl Marx, born of Jewish parents, afterwards converted to Protestantism, and educated at the Universities of Bonn and Berlin. In 1843, he went to reside at Paris, where he made the acquaintance of Frederick Engels, who was to be his faithful assistant in the Socialist campaign. Expelled from Paris in 1848, to took up his residence in

Brussels, where his writings, especially his Manifesto of the Communist party, soon began to attract attention. Finally, he settled down in London, and here he devoted himself entirely to the study of economic questions. His most famous work is *Capital* (*Das Kapital*), the first volume of which was published in 1867. It is in this book that he has given the ablest and best exposition of his views.

Starting from the purely materialistic conception of history, according to which all political, religious, and moral phenomena are but the stages of the process of evolution, he undertook to show that capital, namely, whatever is required for the production of goods, is but the fruits of labour, and has been unjustly taken from the workingman. To prove this, he distinguished between the use value of merchandise and its exchange value. The latter, according to Marx, was to be measured solely by the amount of labour given to its production. Furthermore, the wages given to the labourers fell very far short of the exchange value, and the difference between the exchange value and the wages paid represents the surplus value which should in justice go to the employees, but which in reality goes to build up the fortunes of the capitalists. In this way capital increases daily by theft; the number of capitalists grows less; the means of production are monopolised by a few; and the only remedy that can be applied is the expropriation of these by the state, and the collective ownership of such property.

Since *Das Kapital* was written many minor details in the Socialist programme may have changed, new methods of procedure may have been adopted, but the collective ownership of the means of production is still the watchword of the entire party. In 1864, the foundation of the International Association of Workingmen was laid in London. A commission, composed of representatives of the different countries was appointed to draft the statutes, and the commission accepted the Marxian programme. The international conference held at Geneva

ratified the proposals of the commission. The International spread rapidly in Germany, France, Belgium, and the other Continental countries; yearly conferences were held from 1866 till 1870, newspapers were established, and the movement assumed definite shape. Soon, however, national jealousies sprang up owing in great measure to the Franco-Prussian war, and a considerable party in the society objected to the strong centralised tendencies of Marx and Engels. The Anarchists, led by Bakunin, wanted more violent measures, and more freedom for the national associations. At the conference in the Hague in 1872 the Anarchist section was expelled, and the bureau of the International transferred to Paris. The Anarchists formed a rival association and won many adherents, especially in Italy, Spain, and Belgium. At the international conference in Geneva in 1873 the resolution to group the workmen into professional and national societies was adopted, and the International disappeared. Henceforth, though the spirit of the International remained, the Socialist organisation was national in character, but the international conferences helped to keep up the plan of solidarity. An attempt was made at the Ghent Conference to unite the constitutional Socialists under Marx and the Anarchist groups under Bakunin, but the attempt, as might be expected, proved a failure. In 1889, a great Congress of the Socialists was held in Paris, or, rather, two Congresses representing two sections into which they were divided, the Marxists and the Possibilists. To prepare the way for the collective ownership, which in present circumstances was unattainable, a practical programme of labour reform was agreed upon, and has served since then as the watchword of the Socialist party in the different countries.

With the exception of the Anarchists, the Socialists repudiate the use of violence in the realisation of their schemes. Though their leaders are bitterly hostile to religion, they profess to treat religion as a private concern of the individual, but they strongly insist on the

banishment of religion from education. They aim at capturing the political machinery of the different countries by organising the workingmen's votes, and thus putting themselves in a position to carry out their projected social revolution. Though divided among themselves on many questions, such as their relation to the army, their attitude in case of war, their acceptance or non-acceptance of office in the non-Socialist state, yet the ultimate object of all, namely, the establishment of collective ownership of the means of production is the same.

Since the organisation of the party into professional associations, begun in 1873, the Socialists have made astonishing progress in the different countries. In Germany the war carried on against religion, and the repressive legislation introduced by Bismarck against the Socialists in 1878, favoured the propagation of their views. The two parties, that of Marx, and that of Lassalle, were united in 1875 on the Gotha programme, and in 1891 the Erfurt programme was adopted as that of the German Socialists. Their success in Germany can be judged from the fact that in the Reichstag elections in 1871 they polled only 118,655 votes, whereas in those of 1903 they secured 3,010,710, and succeeded in returning 81 deputies. They have besides the two central organs, the *Vorwärts* and the *Neue Zeit*, 54 daily papers for the spread of their views, not to mention a number of bi-weekly, tri-weekly, weekly, and monthly papers and reviews. Their principal leaders, after the death of Marx and Engels, were Bebel, Kautsky, Vollmar, Bernstein, Auer, and Heine.

In Austria-Hungary, the Socialist movement has followed largely the lines of the German development. Its programme of practical reform is almost identical with that of Erfurt. Each of the national groups of the Empire, Germans, Czechs, Poles, Italians, &c., are organised into separate federal associations, but all work together for the attainment of their object. For a long time the demand for universal suffrage was utilised to

stir up popular sympathy with the party, and the concession of universal suffrage in Austria in 1907 seems to have been favourable to the Socialists. Nearly fifty papers and reviews have been established to support the Socialist propaganda. In Switzerland, though great liberty was given to the organisers of Socialism, and to the foreign exiles, the Socialists have not met with the success that might have been anticipated. This result is due to the want of great industrial centres, the practical character of the Swiss, and the deep religious feeling of the peasantry. In the elections of 1902 the Socialists polled 63,000 votes, and elected seven deputies to the Grand Council.

In France, where, owing to the great political revolutions, Socialism might be expected to flourish, the Socialists are far behind their German brethren, both in organisation and in numbers. Outside the large towns the lower classes show no inclination to support the Socialist campaign, while even in the towns the terrible defeats suffered by the social revolutionary party in 1848 and 1871 tended to discourage future attempts in the same direction. In 1879, the Congress of Marseilles adopted a Socialist programme, and made arrangements to spread the organisation throughout the entire country, but the party did not remain long united. Five independent groups were formed. At present French Socialists, exclusive of the Anarchists, are divided into two main groups, one of which clings to the programme of Marx, the other, the Possibilist group, which is ready to co-operate with the other democratic non-Socialist parties. In the elections of 1906 the whole Socialist vote was about 1,120,000, and of the deputies returned 53 were United Socialists, 22 Independent Socialists, and 143 Radical Socialists. In Belgium, the progress of the Socialists during the last twenty-five years has been very striking. The programme of the party is largely in accordance with the principles of Marx, and their voting strength is naturally in the large industrial centres. At present they number close on 500,000, and are able to

return about one-fifth of the Belgian deputies. The Socialist party in Holland was definitely organised in 1894, and in the elections of 1902 it succeeded in polling 38,000 votes, and in securing the return of seven deputies. Denmark, too, has a strong Socialist party. In 1887, the total number of votes cast for their candidates amounted to 8,408, but in 1903 the number had increased to 56,000. In Norway and Sweden Socialism has made progress during the last twenty years. Many of the Trades Unions and Labour Organisations are openly Socialist, or, without being affiliated, strongly sympathise with the party.

Owing to the peculiar political condition of Italy during the greater part of the nineteenth century, and the prevalence of secret conspiracies, the Italian workmen showed greater preference for the anarchism of Bakunin than for the scientific socialism of Marx. Secret societies, violence, attempted revolutions, and strikes have marked the progress of the agitation in Italy. Before 1892 the groups belonging to the Marxist school had no central organisation, and Socialism could not be regarded as a national movement; but at the conference of Genoa an Italian party was constituted, and the Marxist programme accepted. In 1893, the Congress of Reggio settled definitely the discipline of the party; but soon two factions, the Extremists and the Moderates, contended for control. A truce was made between these sections in 1902 but the difference is too deep laid to permit of any easy settlement. In 1904, the Socialists claimed to have the support of 300,000 voters; but in the elections of 1906 they succeeded in returning only 24 deputies. Spain, too, is more Anarchist than Socialist, and politics and socialism are so interwoven that it is difficult to get a correct idea of the Socialist strength. Except in a few large industrial centres, like Barcelona, where the old party of revolution exercises a considerable influence, Socialism has not influenced the workmen or peasantry. In the elections of 1904 the Socialist vote was about 29,000. A branch of the International League

was established in Portugal in 1871, but had less than fifty members. Since that time the numbers have increased, and a national organisation on the lines of the German Socialism has been instituted (1877). But the movement is so closely united with republicanism that it is impossible to arrive at an accurate notion of its strength. It is, however, relatively unimportant.

In the United States, owing to the gigantic industrial activity, and the economic conditions prevalent in the country, one might naturally have expected that Socialism would have found there all the conditions necessary for its rapid development. Yet, in reality, the progress of Socialism in the United States has not been remarkable. Before the Civil War various attempts were made to establish Socialist organisations, but without much success. It was only in 1869 that a branch of the International was founded at New York by a number of German workmen, who had been won over already to the programme of Marx. The scattered associations were grouped together in 1874 under the title of the Social Democratic Workingmen's Party, and later on the name was changed into the Socialist Labour Party of North America (1877). The great aim of the party was to capture the Trades Unions, especially the Knights of Labour, and the American Confederation, but their efforts in that direction were, to a great extent, foiled. A new Socialist group was organised at the Indianopolis Convention of 1901, and took as its official title the Socialist Party. It, too, aims at capturing the Trades Unions, but the Socialist resolutions were rejected by the American Confederation of Labour in 1903. The Socialist Party is the leading Socialist organisation in the States, and is largely Marxian in its tendency. At the presidential elections of 1904 and 1908 the Socialist candidate, though securing a large number of votes, had, relatively speaking, very limited support. The free constitution of America does not seem to favour the development of the party.

In England, though Marx and Engels were permitted

to formulate their views, and to prepare the Socialist organisation, their theories do not seem to have found much favour with the labouring classes. A Social Democratic Federation, of which Hyndman and Morris were the leading spirits, was established in 1884, but was weakened by a schism created by the extreme party in the following year. The Fabian Society, established, also, in 1884, did much to spread Socialist views among the English people. In 1900, a Labour Representative Committee, in which the Trades Unions, the Independent Labour party (1893), the Social Democratic Federation, and the Fabian Society were represented, was formed. From this body the Social Democratic Federation separated in a short time. In the election of 1906 the Labour Representative Committee had considerable success. The Independent Labour Party in the House of Commons numbered about 30, 19 of whom are said to be Socialists. The Liberal Labour Party also contains a few members of Socialistic tendencies. It is evident that Socialism is one of the forces with which English political parties must seriously reckon in the future.

CHAPTER XII

THE CATHOLIC LABOUR MOVEMENT

Nitti, *Catholic Socialism,* London, 1908. Goyau, *Autour du Catholicisme Social,* 3 vols., Paris, 1908. Battaini, *Il Socialismo e la Democrazia Cristiana*, Siena, 1903. Soderini, *Socialismo e Cattolicismo*, Rome, 1896. Goyau, *Ketteler*, Paris, 1908. Turmann, *Le Développement du Catholicisme Social*, Paris, 1900. Guitart, *La Iglesia y El Obrero*, Barcelona, 1908. Veggian, *Il Movimento Sociale Cristiano*, 4 ed., Vicenza, 1902. Ryan, *A Living Wage*, New York, 1906.

In the struggle between Capital and Labour the Catholic Church could not be an indifferent spectator. Though the Labour question was primarily economic, yet directly and indirectly the interests of the Church promised to be seriously affected. The Socialist leaders were bitterly hostile to religion, and sought to draw away the masses by identifying religion with absolutism in government, and with all that was opposed to the progress of democracy. Such an unfair presentation of the facts, even though historically unfounded, could not fail to produce its effects unless the leading men in the Catholic Church could show by their practical work that the Church in modern times was prepared to be, what she had always been, the protector of the weak, and the champion of justice. At a time when, by the concession of the suffrage, the political power in most countries of Europe was passing into the hands of the people, it was of the utmost importance for Catholicity that it should not be regarded as hostile to the just claims of the working classes. As in the history of Socialism, so also in the history of the Catholic Democratic movement, three distinct stages may be traced, namely, the tentative

period, the scientific theoretic period, and side by side with this, the foundation of the organisations which were to combat the Socialist campaign, and carry the Catholic democratic programme into practical life in the shape of legislative social reforms.

To the first period naturally belongs the French school of writers gathered around de Lamennais and *L'Avenir*. De Lamennais, de Coux, Montalembert, Lacordaire, and the others, grasped the main facts of the situation, and urged the necessity for a close union between the Church and the growing forces of democracy; but their work was spoiled by their failure to appreciate the spirit of their age, their violence of language, their wild exaggerations, and their open disregard of the feelings and prejudices of their opponents. The new Catholic party that arose in France after the condemnation of *L'Avenir*, especially the advanced section, Lacordaire, Ozanam, Maret, de Coux, strove hard for an economic re-organisation of France on the principles of Christianity. They realised the hardships of the economic situation, and the part which the Church should take in preventing a war of classes; and for a while in 1848 it seemed as if the union between the Church and democracy which they contemplated were about to be fully realised. *L'Ére Nouvelle* was the organ of the advanced democratic Catholic party, and was regarded with some suspicion by the Conservatives. The alarming spread of Socialism in France during the period of the Revolution, and the communistic principles enumerated by Proudhon and his followers put an end to such dreams; some of the more advanced Catholic democrats, such as the Abbé Chantôme, were severely reprimanded, and the condemnation of Socialism by Pius IX. (April, 1849) opened the eyes of the leading French Catholics to the dangers of the situation.

Though the movement itself was dead, yet the principles laid down by these French precursors of the Catholic Democratic movement of modern times were not forgotten. Leading ecclesiastics began to turn their

attention to the Labour problem, and to work out a programme of social reform in harmony with the doctrines of the Catholic Church. Amongst them, however, two distinct schools of thought were clearly visible. One section, influenced by the Liberal economic principles, though not denying the necessity for reform, maintained that the Labour question could be settled by the exercise of Christian charity without the interference of the state. By these the purely Labour organisations were regarded as dangerous, and reforms by the method of legislation as opposed to the essential freedom of individual contract between employer and employed. The other, while rejecting the communistic or collectivist principles of Socialism, accepted in great part the programme of reforms proposed by the Socialists. They admitted that religion and Christian charity could go far to allay the bitterness of the labour struggle, but they contended that without the protection of the state, and without the strength guaranteed by purely Labour organisations, the working classes would be left helpless at the mercy of the Capitalists, who controlled in great part the means of production.

The great leader of this advanced Catholic economic party was William Emmanuel von Ketteler, Bishop of Mayence. Born at Münster in Westphalia in 1811, he studied first with the Jesuits in Switzerland, and afterwards at the Universities of Göttingen, Berlin, Heidelberg, and Munich. The arrest of the archbishop of Cologne in 1837 led him to resign the government situation which he held, and after some hesitation he began a course of theology, and was ordained priest in 1844. The abilities of the young priest were soon clearly recognised, as was shown by his appointment to the see of Mayence in 1850. The position of Catholic affairs in the Grand Duchy of Hesse at that period was exceedingly critical, and it required all the tact and courage of the new bishop to safeguard the freedom and interests of the Church. The problem raised by the Socialism of Marx and Lassalle was one likely to appeal to all that was best

in the energetic bishop of Mayence, especially when he discovered that the eloquence of Lassalle threatened to carry away the entire working population of Germany. He felt the necessity of fighting the Socialists by putting forward a programme of social reforms, and by organising the Catholic strength so as to carry that programme into effect. In his book on the Labour Question (*Die Arbeiterfrage und Das Christenthum*), published in 1864, in the conference of Catholic Labour Societies held at Crefeld in 1868, in his speech at the Workmen's meeting at Liebensfrauen in 1869, in his address on Liberalism, Socialism, and Catholicism, delivered in the Catholic Assembly of Germany in 1871, and in the programme which he sketched for the young Centre party he laid the foundation for the great Catholic Democratic movement in Germany.

His theories may be classified under three sections, namely, property, redress of the grievances of the working classes, and the division of profits between Capital and Labour. Against the Socialists, Bishop Ketteler maintained the justice and necessity of individual ownership. The division of property among individuals, according to him, was not absolutely necessary, but was entirely in conformity with the natural law, and could not be suppressed without a violation of justice, of the juridical rights of individuals, families, and civil communities, and without destroying the most powerful incitements to industry, initiative and civil progress. On the other hand, he pointed out that individual ownership was not unlimited, that it was subject to the common good, and if in particular cases the individual ownership of the means of production were injurious, the state had the right of imposing the necessary limitations. This was the old Catholic idea of ownership, and to Ketteler in great part belongs the honour of reviving it in face of the more modern Liberal economic theories.

On the question of the demands of the working classes Ketteler maintained that they were entitled to an augmentation of salary corresponding to the true value

of their labour, to a diminution of the hours of labour, to the regulation of holidays and of the sanitary conditions in the workshops, and to a prohibition of the labour of children and of mothers in factories. The congress of the German bishops, held at Fulda in June, 1868, approved of these demands and vindicated the right of the Church to interfere in the social question. In regard to the division of the profits between Capital and Labour Ketteler advocated the establishment of associations of production, the funds for which, according to him, could be procured not by state intervention but by voluntary contributions dictated by Christian charity.

The efforts of Ketteler have been well seconded by such men as Canon Moufang of Mayence, Schings of Aix-la-Chapelle, Canon Hitze, Count Lösewitz, the Baron von Schorlemer-Alst, the Baron von Hertling, Professors Schultze, Jäger, Winterer, and Weiss. These men adopted the main principles of the bishop of Mayence, but went much further, especially in regard to state interference in the dispute between Capital and Labour. The state, according to them, was entitled to fix the hours and conditions of labour, to protect the young from physical and moral contamination, to encourage co-operative associations amongst the artisans of different trades, to guarantee such associations a legal existence and administrative autonomy, to oblige the employers to insure their workmen against accident or death, as otherwise the compensation laws would prove useless in many cases, and, finally, if necessary, to fix a minimum wage. The Centre party in Germany adopted in great measure the programme of the German Christian Democrats, and have been able to give legislative effect to many of their demands.

From Germany the ideas of Bishop Ketteler and of the Catholic Democratic school spread quickly into Austria, where Socialism was gaining ground with alarming rapidity. The fact that a large share of the wealth of the country was owned by Jewish capitalists helped to increase the bitterness of the class war in the Dual

Empire, and to strengthen the hands of the Socialist leaders. The Jews were the principal supporters of the dominant Liberal party, and were equally hostile to the Catholic religion, and the claims of the working classes. To oppose these the Christian Democratic party was formed in Austria, on the same lines as the Catholic party in Germany. The principal leaders of the school were Rudolph Meyer, Baron von Vogelsang, the Prince von Lichtenstein, and the band of writers gathered around *Das Vaterland* in Vienna. The Christian Democratic party in Austria were more advanced in their views than those of Germany, but were not so successful at first in organising their forces against the Liberals. In 1883, the old industrial corporations, which had been abolished in 1859, were restored in Austria, and the next year a similar law was passed for Hungary. For obvious reasons the Christian Democratic party in Austria and the Antisemitic party, though quite distinct, have many objects in common.

In Switzerland, the bishop of Hebron, afterwards Cardinal Mermillod, followed the example of the bishop of Mayence, and in his sermon delivered at Sainte Clotilde's in 1868, sketched the programme of the Christian Democratic party in Switzerland. But the man who really organised the party was Gaspard Decurtins, who, though an ardent Catholic himself, and a strong supporter of the Papal Encyclical on Labour, had succeeded in securing the friendly co-operation of both Catholic and Protestant workmen in his campaign against Capitalism and Socialism. To his exertions are largely due the foundation and success of the Catholic University of Freiburg, which serves as a training centre for the men who are to conduct the Christian Democratic campaign in Switzerland.

In France the Catholics interested in economic questions may be divided into two classes, the conservative school, which adopts more or less the Liberal principles, and is inclined to limit the interference of the state in the struggle between employers and employed, and the

democratic school, which has adopted many of the principles of the German Catholic democratic party. The leaders of the conservative school were M. Charles Périn, Professor in Louvain University, M. Claudio Jannet, Monseigneur Freppel, and Father Ludovic de Besse. The principal leader of the more democratic section is Count de Mun, the founder of the *Oeuvre des Cercles Catholiques d' Ouvriers*. His aim was the establishment of the guild or corporation system, and it was mainly by the exertions of himself and his party that the law of 1884, guaranteeing the legal existence of the syndicates of production, was passed. The principal associates of de Mun were the Marquis La Tour du Pin Chambly, MM. Montalembert, Grandmaison, de Poncheville, and de Ramel. A prominent supporter of the free guild system, as opposed to the state guilds of de Mun, is M. Léon Harmel, who, in his own works at Val-de-Bois, has shown the practical value of his suggestions. The *Association Catholique des Patrons du Nord de la France* has followed in great part the example given by Harmel in his establishment of Val-de-Bois. Finally, the party gathered around Marc Sangier and *Le Sillon* have in recent years put forward a more advanced programme of reform.

In Belgium, the alarming spread of Socialism made it necessary for the Catholics to adopt a Labour programme, but unfortunately the Socialists had already secured a strong foothold in the country. The most prominent men in the movement were Monseigneur Doutreloux, Bishop of Liège, and Abbé Pottier. In Italy very little attention was paid to social questions till comparatively recent times, though the subject was not entirely neglected by such writers as Tapparelli d' Azeglio, Liberatore, Curci, and the writers of the *Civiltà*. In 1874, the first general Catholic Labour organisation in Italy, the *Opera dei Congressi e dei Comitati Cattolici*, was established at Venice by Count Aquaderni, and quickly spread into different parts of the country. The pastoral letter of the bishop of Perugia, afterwards

Leo XIII. in 1877, was a strong condemnation of the Liberal principles of economics, and an appeal for a more Christian treatment of the working classes. The Italian Catholics are, however, very much divided, nor could all the efforts of Pius X. succeed in putting an end to their divisions.

In the English speaking countries Cardinal Manning was a strong supporter of the policy initiated in Germany by the bishop of Mayence. In his famous speech at Leeds on *The Rights and Duty of Labour* in 1874, in his letters to the *Times*, in an article in the *Fortnightly Review*, and in his public correspondence, he clearly formulated the principles of state intervention for the protection of the workmen, of a minimum salary and of the right of workmen to employment. The question of the Knights of Labour in the United States afforded the Catholic hierarchy of the United States an opportunity of expressing sympathy with the claims of the labouring classes in America; while the strong support given by the Irish bishops to the agrarian movement in Ireland showed clearly that they admitted state interference in the contracts between landlords and tenants. In Spain, Portugal, and the leading countries of South America the principles of the Catholic Democratic movement found some support.

But for so far, though the movement had spread into different countries, the old divisions between the conservative and democratic Catholic economists remained. This difference of opinion was specially clear in reference to the questions of salary, state intervention, and the organisation of purely labour societies, or of mixed bodies representing employers and employed. Several Catholic writers, such as Cardinal Manning and Father Lehmkuhl, maintained that the state should intervene not only in regard to the hours and conditions of labour but also in regard to the wages paid, by fixing a minimum salary; while representatives of the conservative school strongly resisted such a contention. In France and in Belgium some held that the trades asso-

ciations or guilds should comprise only workmen, while others wished to see them constituted on the mixed basis, and open equally to employers and employed. Again, the tendency of the movement was different in different countries. In Austria it was controlled largely by the aristocratic element, in Switzerland by the democratic party, while in Germany a happy combination of both forces directed the policy and tactics of the party. It was felt that some means should be adopted for the introduction of more uniformity, and for the establishment of closer relations between the national groups into which the Catholic Democratic parties were divided.

In Rome, Cardinal Jacobini (+1900), nuncio at Lisbon, and Cardinal Mermillod had organised an Academy of social studies; in France, a similar work was done by the directors of the *Cercles Catholiques*; while in Germany the annual congress of the Catholics afforded an opportunity for discussing the different economic problems. Through these three bodies an international conference, *The Union of Fribourg,* was established. It met yearly, and was attended by many of the leading Catholic leaders, clerics and laymen, from Italy, France, and Germany. The International Scientific Congresses held at Paris in 1888 and 1891 afforded another opportunity for the discussion of the social question under its international aspect; while the Catholic Social Congresses of Liège (1887,1890) served to bring out prominently the main principles upon which Catholic economists were united, as well as the issues upon which a difference of opinion existed between the conservative and democratic schools. By means of these discussions and congresses a better understanding of the underlying principles were being arrived at, and the way was being prepared for an authoritative intervention of the Holy See.

Leo XIII., as archbishop of Perugia, had already shown his interest in the Labour question, and since his accession to the Papacy, had made it clear that while he condemned Socialism and Anarchy, he strongly sym-

pathised with the just demands of the labouring classes. He followed with interest the progress of the democratic movement in Germany, Austria, Switzerland, France, and Italy, and noted the results of the congresses at Freiburg, Paris, and Liège. The question of the Knights of Labour in 1887, and the strong memorial presented on their behalf by Cardinal Gibbons, supported by Cardinal Manning, the agrarian difficulties in Ireland, and the pilgrimages of workmen from France, Belgium, and Germany helped to bring home to the Pope the importance and necessity of favouring the democratic movement, and at the same time of keeping it within the bounds prescribed by Christian morality. Hence, he determined to issue an Encyclical which might serve as a guide for Catholic workers in the field of social reform.

The Encyclical on the labour question, *Rerum Novarum,* was published in May, 1891. In this document Leo XIII. began by a frank acknowledgment of the grievances of the labouring classes. These grievances he traced principally to the abolition of the artisans' guilds, usury, unrestricted competition, and the monopoly of production and trade by means of which a very limited number of excessively wealthy men were enabled to impose upon the masses of the people a yoke little better than that of slavery. The remedy for this evil, according to the Pope, was not to be sought in the abolition of private ownership, which is a right guaranteed by the natural law, nor in the monopolisation of all the means of production by the state. Having rejected the Socialist scheme, it remained for Leo XIII. to propose his own schemes for the solution of the problem. He pointed out that it was impossible to reduce human society to the same dead level, that inequalities were the result of natural laws, and instead of being disadvantageous to the individual or the community, tended rather to encourage the harmony of the social body. Hence, the capitalists and the labourers should not be regarded as two naturally hostile bodies. One depended

upon the other, and if both were governed in their mutual relations by the principles of Christian charity the conflct of interests might be deprived of much of its bitterness.

But, in addition to this, the state should intervene to protect the interests of the working classes, especially in regard to the hours of labour, the sanitary conditions of factories and workshops, the conditions of employment of women and children, and the cessation of work on Sundays and holidays. In reference to wages, the Pope repudiated the Liberal principles of economics, according to which wages were to be left entirely to the mercy of free contract. The rate of remuneration should be sufficient to support the wage-earner in reasonable and frugal comfort, and to prevent conflicts on this subject, boards or societies should be established with the sanction of the state to see that the interests of both parties were duly protected. The Pope, too, recognised the important part played by the artisans' guilds of the Middle Ages, and hoped that associations of the same kind, but adapted to modern economic conditions, could be established once more.

The Encyclical of Leo XIII. was warmly welcomed not alone by Catholics, but also by those outside the Church. Its main principles were immediately adopted by advocates of social reform outside the ranks of the Socialists, and served as a programme which Catholic economists of all shades of opinion could adopt. But the programme would be comparatively worthless without an organisation to give it practical effect. Marx, on his side, had shown his appreciation of this by the establishment of the International Association for the development of Socialism, and Ketteler aimed at counteracting the International by the establishment of similar associations on Christian principles.

Germany has led the way in the establishment of a Catholic Labour organisation. Father Kolping had already begun this work in the Rhine Provinces in 1847 by the establishment of the *Gesellenvereine* (Journeymen

clubs), and Kolping's work was strongly recommended for imitation by the bishop of Mayence. Branches of the association have been established in every industrial centre in Germany. Apprentices' associations on similar lines were founded to save the young men engaged in learning their trades from falling an easy prey to the Socialist agitators, and Trades Unions on Christian principles were founded to protect the interests of the workmen, and resist the inroads of Socialism. In addition to this the small farmers and labourers were organised in the *Bauern-Vereine*, begun by Baron von Schorlemer-Alst and Father Brücker in Westphalia in 1867. All these professional associations are united together in the *Volksverein*, established by Windthorst at Cologne in 1890. By means of these organisations the Catholics of Germany have succeeded in keeping together the capitalists, labourers, merchants, and agriculturists, and by a spirit of mutual agreement and compromise all these apparently conflicting interests unite in supporting the Centre party, which is the strongest in the *Reichstag*, and has been, at the same time, most successful in securing legislative social reforms.

In Austria, the power of the Liberal party, backed mainly by Jewish capitalists, was so great that the foundation of a Catholic Democratic party seemed an utter impossibility. Still the work was undertaken by the Prince von Lichtenstein, the Baron von Vogelsang, Count Blöme, &c., and with the aid of the *Vaterland* their ideas soon began to exercise an influence upon the masses of the people. In 1891, the more advanced Catholic party under the leadership of Dr. Lueger, formed an alliance with the Antisemitic party for the purpose of breaking the power of the Jewish Liberals in the municipal council of Vienna. Their efforts were successful in 1895, but a campaign was begun against them, supported by the court and by the more conservative section among the Catholics. An attempt was made to secure their condemnation at Rome, but the nuncio at Vienna, Cardinal Agliardi, was friendly to their cause, and Rome refused

to intervene. Since that time the Christian Democratic party in Austria has rapidly increased in strength, so that at the present time it can boast of having the largest representation in the Austrian Chamber. In the organisation of their forces, the Austrian Catholics have imitated the methods of their German co-religionists.

The lead given to the Catholic democratic movement in Switzerland by Cardinal Mermillod was productive of good results, thanks mainly to the efforts of Gaspard Decurtins. Though a thoroughly loyal Catholic, and specially devoted to the Holy See, he has had no fear of making common cause with all who are willing to work for social reform as far as Christian ethics might permit. Through his energy the great *Arbeiterbund*, the workmen's association of Switzerland, was established in 1886, and though the association is itself non-sectarian, yet, by securing the affiliation to it of the Catholic societies, Decurtins has been enabled to use it in securing useful legislation, and also in preventing the spread of Socialism. Besides, in 1894, at a conference held in Lucerne, it was resolved to establish a popular Catholic party, on the lines of the German Centre party, and since 1903 an annual congress of the Swiss Catholics has been arranged. In few places has the Catholic democratic movement been productive of better results during the last quarter of a century than in Switzerland.

In Belgium several societies had been established before 1891, but very little had been done to prepare a comprehensive programme of social reform, or to unite the scattered bodies into one strong organisation. The need for some such steps had, however, been felt by men like the Abbé Pottier, who understood the rapidity with which Socialism was spreading in industrial centres like Liège. In 1891, the Democratic League of Belgium was founded by Helleputte and Verhaegen, and the Christian Democratic Union of Liège by the Abbé Pottier in 1892. By means of these it was hoped to secure a Federation of all the Catholic societies in Belgium, but soon difficulties sprang up between the conservative and democratic sec-

tions of the Catholic party. The bishop of Liège, Mgr. Doutreloux, acting on instructions from Rome, endeavoured to bring about a reconciliation between the two bodies, who were divided mainly on the question whether the Catholic Trades Associations should be composed of both employers and employed, or should be open only to workmen. Leo XIII. intervened to bring about a settlement, and a conference was arranged between the representatives of all parties at Mechlin (March, 1896). A common programme was agreed upon, and the Abbé Daens, who refused to accept the terms of the agreement, was expelled from the Catholic Federation in 1897. Owing mainly to the democratic policy adopted, the Catholic party in Belgium has been enabled to hold the reins of government for the past quarter of a century ; and what is of more importance, has been enabled to give a lead to the rest of Europe on the question of legislative social reforms.

INDEX

A

Aachen, Catholic Congress, i. 323
Aargau, i. 126, 131, 345, 346; suppression of the monasteries, in, i. 133, 134
Abbot, Mr., ii. 19
Abel, i. 110
Aberdeen, Lord, ii. 204
Abyssinia, ii. 435; Emperor of, defeats Italians, i. 474
Academy of St. Thomas, Rome, ii. 468
Academy of social studies, ii. 519
Acciajoli, i. 173
Achéry d', ii. 437
Achterfeld, Professor, ii. 457, 458
Ackermann, ii. 471, 480
Acta Sanctorum, ii. 478
Acton, Sir John, afterwards Lord, i. 447, 455, 462; ii. 59, 64, 65, 460
Addington, ii. 149
Addison, Judge, ii. 280
Adelaide, diocese of, ii. 386, 392, 393
Adelaide University, ii. 411
Aertnys, ii. 486
Aeterni Patris, Encyclical, ii. 468
Affari vos, Encyclical, ii. 346
Affre, Mgr., i. 234, 236
Africa, missions in, ii. 421-24, 435
Agar, Archbishop, ii. 119
Agatha, St., Church of, ii. 194, 200, 265
Agliardi, Cardinal, ii. 522
Agrarian troubles in Ireland, i. 479, ii. 520
Aherne, Dr., ii. 259
Aiblinger, ii. 488
Aix, i. 17
Aix-la-chapelle, ii. 515
Albani, Cardinal, i. 29, 214.
Alban's, St., ii. 84
Albany, ii. 313, 315
Albert, i. 233
Albertus-Magnus. Verein, i. 323
Alcalá, ii. 253
Alcantarins, ii. 439
Aleppo, vicariate of, ii. 429, 430
Alexander I. of Russia, i. 48, 189
Alexander II. of Russia i. 398, 402, 477-8
Alexander III. of Russia, i. 402, 477
Alexandria, patriarchate of, ii. 429
Algeria, ii. 435. *See* Lavigerie
Alien Act, ii. 286
Allgemeine Zeitung, i. 444-5, 455 6
All Hallows College, ii. 264, 266, 319, 416
Alliance, Holy, i. 208
Alliance, L,' i. 357
Allies and Napoleon, i. 49; Paris taken by, i. 50, 52, 53, 54; and Switzerland, i. 126; and Belgium, i. 143; and Pius VII., i. 208
Allies, T. W., ii. 54, 55, 56
Alphonsus XII. of Spain, i. 384, 387
Alphonsus XIII. of Spain, i. 389
Althorp, ii. 177, 181
Alva, Duke of, i. 153
Alzog, i. 442; ii. 461, 475, 483
Amadeus, i. 384
Amann, Professor, i. 122
Ambassador of Christ, ii. 294
Ambrose, St., ii. 39
Amelia of Saxony, i. 165
America, Church in. *See* United States, Canada, Central and South America; revolution in, i. 8; American bishops at Vatican Council, i. 450, 452, 461
America (Review), ii., 442
American Confederation, ii. 509
American, Native Party, ii. 288, *sqq.*
American Protective Association (A. P. A.), ii. 290-1, 323
Americanism, ii. 332-35, 463
Amiens, synod of, ii. 449
Ampleforth, ii. 76
Analecta, Novissima, ii. 476
Analecta, Spicilegio Solesmensi parata, ii. 476
Analecta, Bollandiana, ii. 478
Ancona, i. 40
Anecdota Maredsolana, ii. 476
Angelis, de, Cardinal, i. 458
Angers, Catholic Institute, i. 257; ii. 492

Anglade, Dr., ii. 259
Anglesey, Marquis of, ii. 170
Anglican Church, ii. 24–29; 38, 39, bishop at Jerusalem, ii. 43; Orders, ii. 71–74. *See* England
Anglicanism, ii. 76–86. *See* England; High Church party, endeavour of to secure an ecclesiastical court of appeal; interference of secular authorities; introduction of Divorce Bill, ii. 77; High Church party distracted by controversy on Eucharist, ii. 77; High Church party and Evangelicals unite against Broad Church, ii. 78; *Essays and Reviews*, ii. 79-80; Colenso controversy, ii. 80; Colenso refuses to resign, and is deposed by metropolitan; decision of metropolitan set aside by Privy Council; successor to Colenso appointed, ii. 81; ritualist movement occasions still further disputes; extreme ritualists advocate union with Rome, *the Union Journal* is founded and *A. P. U. C.* is established, ii. 82; association condemned by bishops, ii. 83; *O. C. R.* founded, ii. 83; ritualists found *English Church Union*, and Low Church party found *Church Association*, ii. 83; ritualists brought into civil courts, ii. 84; dispute about Athanasian creed, ii. 84; Public Worship Regulation Act becomes law, ii. 85; Lambeth conference fails to adjust differences, but primate succeeds to some extent; trial of bishop of Lincoln, and confirmation of decision by Privy Council, ii. 86.
Anglo-Romaine, Revue La, ii. 72, 74
Annam, province of, ii. 434
Année, L' Liturgique, ii. 456
Anticoncordataires, i. 36
Antigonish, College of St. Francis Xavier at, ii. 347
Antigua, Island of, ii. 427
Anti-Janus, i. 445
Antilles, vicariate of, ii. 426
Antioch, patriarchate of, ii. 429
Antisemitic party in Austria, ii. 516, 522
Anton, Aloysius, i. 467
Antonelli, Cardinal, i. 421, 424, 437
Antrim, Co., ii. 132
Antwerp. *See* Convention, i. 358; ii. 254, 274
Aosta, Duke of, i. 383
Apellatio ab abusu in France, i. 36, 249, 271; in Bavaria, i. 103, 108; in Ecuador, ii. 367
Apollinare University, neo-scholasticism in, ii. 468
Apologetics in nineteenth century, ii. 479-481. *See* studies
Apologists of nineteenth century, ii. 481
Apologia of Newman, ii. 60-1
"Apostolic Army," i. 165
Apostolicae Curae. *See* Bulls
"April movement" in Holland, i. 374
Aquhorties, Seminary of, ii. 89, 90, 92
Arabia, vicariate of, ii 430
Arbeiterbund, i. 354, ii. 523
Arbuthnot, Sir William, ii. 92
Archæology, ii. 466, 470, 476-7. *See* Rossi de
Arches, Court of, ii. 53, 77, 84
Arcoli, i. 26
Arellano, nuncio, in Spain, i. 169
Argentine Republic, political vicissitudes of, ii. 374; laws favourable to Catholic Church, ii. 375; favourable laws not strictly observed by government, ii. 375; method of nomination of bishops and of nomination to benefices, ii. 375; education of clergy, ii. 375
Argyle, ii. 95
Armagh. *See* Crolly, Cullen. Co. of, ii. 132, 145, 155, 231
Armellini, i. 423
Armenian Rite, ii. 430-431; schism in Armenian Church, i. 481
Armidale, diocese of, ii. 395, 397
Arm's Act, ii. 128
Arnim, Count, i. 462
Arnold of Brescia, i. 472
Arnold, Dr., ii. 25, 26, 33, 39, 42, 43
Articles. *See* Organic Articles; or Gallican Church, i. 36, 57, ii. 446; of Baden conference, i. 130, 131; thirty-nine, ii. 41
Artois, d' Count, i. 12
Arundel, Lord, of Wardour, ii. 272
Asia, Catholic Missions in, ii. 429-35

Assembly of the Notables in France, i. 10; of the States General, i. 10; the National Assembly, i. 10-20; the Legislative Assembly, i. 19-20; General Assembly of Second Republic, i. 235; National Assembly and Third Republic, i. 251-54; National Assembly in Portugal, i. 176 *et seq.*; Frankfort Assembly, i. 3, 114, 116, 278; General Assembly of German Catholics, i. 279
Assermentés, i. 18
Assignats, i. 14
Association for Discountenancing Vice, &c., ii. 219
Association Catholique des Patrons du Nord de la France, ii. 517
Association, Catholic (Ireland), ii. 163-70
Association Bill in France, i. 269, 276; in Spain, i. 389
Associations of worship in France, i. 275-6
Assumptionists dissolved, i. 268
Astruc, ii. 469
Asturias, revolt of, i. 161
Atheism, i. 215, 244-45
Athenæum Club, ii. 67
Atlantis (Review of Catholic University of Ireland), ii. 245
Auckland, diocese of, ii. 400, 401
Auctorem fidei. *See* Bulls
Auer, ii. 506
Auerstädt, i. 42
Aufklärung, Die, i. 70, 102; ii. 449-51
Augsburg, bishop of, i. 106
Augustine, St., ii. 39, 40, 483
Augustinians, ii. 433
Augustus III. of Poland, i. 183
Austerlitz, battle of, i. 42
Australia, discovery of, by Spaniards; occupation of by Dutch and English; convict settlement in, ii. 378, 379; cruelty of English Government towards Irish Catholics in Australia, ii. 379; arrival of Irish priests in Australia, ii. 379 *et seq.*; hapless condition of Catholic convicts, ii. 381; Government appoints two Catholic chaplains, ii. 381; brighter days for Catholic Church, ii. 383; Dr. Ullathorne vicar-general and Dr. Polding vicar-apostolic, ii. 384; further
Australia—*continued*
development of church, ii. 384-86; population of Australia at establishment of hierarchy, ii. 387; stages in the development of Australian Church, ii. 387, *et seq.*; dissensions between regular and secular clergy, ii. 395; obstacles to convocation of a general synod, ii. 396; an informal meeting, ii. 396; matter for future discussion decided at a second informal meeting, ii. 396; bishops taking part in synod, ii. 397; decrees passed, ii. 397; Australian bishops at Vatican Council, ii. 397; Cardinal Moran first Australian cardinal, plenary synod, ii. 397; further progress of Australian Church in recent years, ii. 398; synods, matters discussed at, ii. 402; method of electing bishops, ii. 402 *et seq.*; diocesan consultors, ii. 403; establishment of irremovable rectors, ii. 404; education at first Protestant, ii. 404; Government makes some slight concessions to Catholics in matter of education, ii. 405; undenominational schools established, ii. 406; establishment of National School Board and Denominational School Board, ii. 407; further amendment of school system and hostile attitude of authorities towards Catholic schools, ii. 407; Catholic Association formed, ii. 407; Public Instruction Bill carried, ii. 408; effects of, ii. 408; strong opposition of Catholic bishops to bill, ii. 408; measures of third plenary council in reference to education, ii. 408; flourishing condition of Catholic schools in the various provinces of Australia, ii. 409; secondary schools and university education, ii. 411
Austria and Napoleon, i. 27, 28, 43, 84; interferes with Papal election i. 29; Church in, i. 75-88; Joseph II., i. 75-81; Leopold II., i. 83-84; Francis II., i. 84; Ferdinand I., i. 86-88; Austria and the Papal States, i. 220, 222, 240 *et seq.*; Francis Joseph, emperor, i. 327; concessions and

Austria—*continued*
concordat, i. 328, 329; Catholic education, i. 329, 332; civil marriage law, i. 331; new anti-Catholic liberal legislation, i. 333; Catholic reaction, i. 334; Pan-Germanism and *Los-Von-Rom* movement, i. 335. *See* Hungary; Catholic education and organisation, i. 338; Austria and Italy, i. 420. *See* Papal States; Austria and Infallibility, i. 463, 467; Old Catholics in, i. 467; Leo XIII. and, i. 477; the *Aufklärung* in, ii. 449-50; ecclesiastical education in, ii. 494; socialism in, ii. 506; Catholic democracy in, ii. 515-16, 522; clergy in, i. 75, 329
Autorité, L., i. 264
Autun, i. 14
Avenir, L', i. 61, 62, 63, 68, 223, 240, 440; ii. 448, 491
Avignon, i. 19; lost to Pope, i. 26
Azara, i. 78

B

Babylon, bishop of, ii. 429
Baden, Church in, i. 111, 288, 313; boycott of Catholics, i. 113; Cæsarism in, i. 289-291; end of struggle, convention, i. 291; struggle renewed, i. 293; Kulturkampf, i. 313-15; Catholic People's Party, and end of persecution, i. 315; Catholic education, i. 320
Baden, conference and articles, i. 130
Bagdad, archbishopric of, ii. 430
Baggot Street (Training College), ii. 230
Bailly, works of, ii. 446, 447
Bakunin, ii. 505
Balbo, Count, and federal union of Italy, i. 230
Balkan provinces, church in, i. 405-10. *See* Turkey, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina Bulgaria, Roumania, Greece
Ballarat, ii. 391, 392
Ballerini, ii. 486
Ballybay, ii. 169
Balmes, ii. 467, 481
Baltimore, ii. 272, 273, 275; synods, ii. 275, 292, 295, 296; first plenary council of, ii. 297; second plenary council, ii. 299-301; third plenary council, ii., 202-4; work of these councils, ii. 304-17; St. Mary's College, ii. 273; diocese of, ii. 277, 315
Baltimore, Lord, ii. 268
Baltzer, i. 461, 462; ii. 457, 458, 459
Banagher, ii. 231
Baptist, Society, ii. 219, 222
Bar, confederation of, i. 184
Barcelona, ii. 508
Bardenhewer, ii. 474, 476
Bardstown, ii. 277, 295
Barial, Bishop, ii. 446
Barnabo, Mgr., ii. 207
Barrios, General, ii. 356
Barron, Fr., ii. 323
Bartolo, ii. 473
Basilians, ii. 442
Basil, St., monks of, i. 188, 192
Basle, i. 127, 129, 344, 345, 346, 351
Basque provinces and Carlist war, i. 166-7
Bastille stormed, i. 12
Basutoland, ii. 422
Basutos, 423
Batavian Republic, i. 25
Bathurst, diocese of, ii. 394, 397
Bathyanyi, Cardinal, i. 78
Battifol, ii. 476, 477, 487
Bauern-Verein, ii. 522
Bäumker, Professor, ii. 469
Baümer, O.S.B., ii. 438
Baur, ii. 471, 480
Bautain, 224, 440; ii. 453, 479
Bavaria, Church in, i. 101, 111, 284-88; concordat, i. 107; revolution, i. 111; Liberal government, anti-Catholic, i. 286-88; fall of, i. 289; Kulturkampf, i. 316-18; Catholic education, i. 320; Bavaria and Infallibility, i. 444, 462; clergy, i. 101, 109, 295
Bayle, i. 7.
Bazard, ii. 502
Bazaine, Marshal, i. 250
Beagle Bay, ii. 390
Beaufort, i. 143
Beauharnais, i. 43
Bebel, ii. 506
Bedford, Duke of, ii. 104

Beernaert, i. 362, 367
Beethoven, ii. 487
Beirut, Jesuit College at, ii. 430, 474
Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters, ii. 469
Belfast corporation, ii. 189
Belgium, Church in, i. 139; and Joseph II., i. 139; concordat, i. 147; united with Holland, i. 143; persecution under William I., i. 145; liberalism and conservatism, i. 148; war with Holland, i. 149, 223; independence of, i. 150; Church and State, i. 150; conflict of Catholics and Liberals, i. 152, 356 *et seq.*; convention of Antwerp, i. 358; Catholics organised, i. 360; education struggle, i. 358, 361, 363, 365; "loi de malheur," i. 363; overthrow of Liberals, i. 366; peace with Holy See and Catholic social work programme, i. 367-370; progress of the Church, i. 371; clergy in, i. 141-6; ecclesiastical education, ii. 495; Socialism, ii. 507-8; Catholic democracy, i. 369; ii. 517, 523-4
Bellasis, ii. 54, 55
Belleville, programme of, i. 249, 250
Bellerophon, the, i. 54
Bellew, Christopher, ii. 123; Sir Patrick, ii. 112; William, ii. 141
Belnagare, ii. 104
Benedict XIV., ii. 430
Benedictines, Order of, ii. 319, 389, 416, 437; sufferings of in Austria and at the time of the Revolution, ii. 437; present organisation of, ii. 437; notable men of the order in nineteenth century, 438; work in foreign missions, ii. 438
Benedictine nuns, ii. 314
Benevento, i. 41
Benson, Archbishop, ii. 71, 72, 86; Father, ii. 392
Bentley (Architect), ii. 70
Benvenuti, Cardinal, i. 220
Beresford, John, Commissioner of Revenue, ii. 120, 129; Lord George, ii. 166; General. i. 176
Berington, Dr., ii. 7-8
Berlage, ii. 483
Berlin, University, ii. 513
Bernard, Mount St., i. 28
Bernadotte, i. 41
Berne, i. 131, 124; persecutions in, ii. 347; Old Catholic faculty of theology in, ii. 468
Bernetti, Cardinal, i. 221
Bernier, Mgr., i. 34
Bernstein, ii. 506
Berryer, i. 237
Bert, Paul, i. 246, 257
Berthier, Abbé, i. 31, 32, 44
Berthier, General, i. 26; ii. 14, 148
Besse, O. S. B., ii. 438
Besse, Professor, ii. 469
Beust, Count, i. 331, 332
Bible. *See* Ecclesiastical Studies
Bible Societies, i. 215-16, 218, 436; ii. 174, 220
Biblische Zeitschrift, ii. 474
Bicheno, Mr., ii. 185
Bienvenu, M., i. 274
Bilio, Cardinal, i. 440, 451, 457
Billot, ii. 484
Binterim, ii. 457
Birma, ii. 434
Birmingham, ii. 49
Bishops: method of appointing in France, i. 32-3; i. 272-3, 276; in Prussia, i. 91; in Bavaria, i. 108; in the Upper Rhine provinces, i. 115; in Switzerland, i. 129; in Belgium, i. 147, 151; in Holland, i. 156; in Spain, i. 170; in Portugal, i. 181, 390, 393; in Poland and Russia, i. 195; in Italy, i. 434; in Ireland, ii. 172; in the United States, ii. 304-6; in Australia, ii. 402-3; bishops of France and the Civil Constitution of the Clergy; Constitutional, i. 18, 34; national council of in Paris and Pius VII., i. 47; re-assembly of, i. 48; prince bishops, i. 72; and government of Austria; and government of Bavaria, i 107; and Rhine Provinces, i. 114, 117; Belgium, i. 141, 142, 145
Bismarck, i. 232. 250, 253, 290, 299, 300, 307 *et seq.*; 310, 512, 465-6, 475
Blairs, College, ii. 92, 97
Blake, Mr., ii. 185, 223
Blanc, Louis, i. 233-4; ii. 502; Professor, ii. 469
Bleek, ii. 470
Bloc in France, i. 267, 272
Blockade, Continental, i. 41, 42, 48, 161, 175

Bloemfontein, ii. 423
Bloudoff, Count, i. 194
Blue Book, English Catholic Committee, ii. 7
Blum, Bishop, i. 298
Boedder, ii. 469
Boers, ii. 423, 424
Bohemia, *Los-Von-Rom* movement in, i. 335-6
Bohusz, Archbishop, rebuked by Pius VII., i. 189
Boisgelin, de, Archbishop, i. 17, 35
Bole, ii. 487.
Bolivar, ii. 369, 371
Bolivia, Church in, political vicissitudes of, ii. 371; state of Catholic Church, ii. 371; condition of religious orders, ii. 371; provisions for clerical education, ii. 371
Böll, Bernard, Archbishop of Freiburg, i. 116, 118, 123
Bollandists, ii. 478
Bombay, diocese of, ii. 420
Bonald, Vicomte de, i. 68; ii. 447, 451, 452, 453, 479
Bonaparte. *See* Napoleon; Joseph, i. 32, 41, 42, 43, 49; and Church in Spain, i. 161; Louis, i. 42; Jerome, King of Westphalia, i. 42; Prince Canino, i. 237
Bond, Oliver, ii. 128
Boniface, St., diocese of, ii. 341
Bonn, ii. 493. *See* University
Bonnetty, ii. 454
Bordeaux, ii. 254; Duke of, i. 227
Borodino, battle of, i. 48
Bosco, Don, ii. 442
Bosnia and Herzegovina, Church in, i. 407
Boston, diocese of, ii. 277, 288, 295, 313
Botany Bay, ii. 378, 379, 380, 381
Boulanger, General, i. 265
Boulter, Primate, ii. 217
Bourbon, Duc de, i. 12
Bourbons. *See* France; expulsion from Naples, i. 42; recalled to France, i. 52, 60
Bourgeois M., i. 246
Bourget, Bishop, ii. 341
Bourke, Governor, ii. 385, 387
Boutenieff, Count, i. 194
Bowles, Mr., ii. 47
Boxer Rebellion, ii. 433
Boylan, Brother, ii. 314
Brady, Dr., bishop of Perth, ii. 389
Brady, John, M.P., ii. 207
Bramston, Dr., ii. 384
Braughall, Thomas, ii. 115
Braun, Professor, ii. 457, 458
Braunsberg, Lyceum, i. 462, 464; ii. 493
Bray, Archbishop of Cashel, ii. 142, 222
Brazil, Church in, change from imperial to republican form of government, ii. 376; low condition of Church under Empire, ii. 376; separation of Church and State carried out, ii. 377; good results of Separation Law, ii. 377
Breslau, ii. 493
Breviary, The, ii. 487
Briand, M., ii. 336, 338
Brief Memorial of Dr. Milner, ii. 19
Brienne, de, i. 17
Brinkman, Bishop, i. 307
Brisbane, ii. 393; Bishop of, ii. 396, 397
Bristol, Earl of, Bishop of Derry, ii. 112
Britain, Great. *See* England, Scotland
British and Foreign Bible Association, ii. 220
British and Irish Ladies' Society, ii. 222
British Honduras, Vicariate of, ii. 426
British North America Act, ii. 343
Brittany, i. 2, 5
Brixen, Bishop of, i. 106
Broglie, de, Bishop, i. 143, 145
Broglie, Duc de, i. 111, 256, 257
Brooklyn, ii. 275, 315
Brothers, of the Christian Schools, ii. 347; of the Sacred Heart, ii. 347; of St. Gabriel, ii. 347; of Charity for Education of poor in city of New York, ii. 314; of John Baptist de la Salle, ii. 315; Irish Christian, ii. 220, 443
Broughton, Dr., ii. 385
Brownlow, ii, 120
Brunner, i. 112
Bruno, Giordano, i. 473
Brunswick, Duke of, i. 20, 22
Brussels, University of, i. 357. *See* University; i. 140, 357, 365; ii. 416, 504; revolution in, i. 149
Buckingham, Marquis of, ii. 12
Buckley, Dr., V.A., ii. 426
Bulgaria, Church in, i. 407-9

Bulls, Papal, *Auctorem Fidei*, i. 82; *De Salute animarum*, i. 91; *Provida solersque*, i. 115; *Ad Dominici gregis custodiam*, i. 116; *Quam memoranda*, i. 201; *Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum*, i. 210; ii. 440; *Aeterni Patris*, i. 291, 443; *Ineffabilis Deus*, i. 439; *Quanta Cura*, i. 440; ii. 60, 462; *Sollicitudo ecclesiarum*, i. 225, 227; *Cum in sublimi*, i. 296; *Humanae salutis auctor*, ii. 420; *Unigenitus*, ii. 444; Bull condemning the civil constitution of the clergy, i. 18, 26; of excommunication against Napoleon, i. 92; *Catholicae Fidei*, ii. 440
Bullarium Romanum, ii. 477
Bullettino de Archeologia Cristiana, ii. 476
Bulliat, Sulpician, ii. 469
Bülow, Count, i. 313
Bund, Arbeiter-, i. 353-4
Bund Deutscher-, i. 73, 353-4
Bunsen, von, i. 94, 95, 97
Burdett, Sir Francis, ii. 165
Burke, Edmund, ii. 3, 88, 101, 102, 108, 118, 120, 128, 144, 256, 257, 340
Burke, Dr., in Canada, ii. 340
Burke, Richard, ii. 118, 259
Burrowes, ii. 154
Burton, ii. 154
Bushe, ii. 120
Butler, Charles, ii. 4, 7, 18, 20, 128, 198
Butler, Dom, O.S.B., ii. 438
Butler, Lord Dunboyne, founds the Dunboyne establishment (Maynooth), ii. 261
Byrne, Edward, ii. 115, 117, 122, 123

C

Cabet, Étienne, ii. 502
Cabral, i. 181
Cabrera, General, i. 167
Cabrol, Dom, O.S.B., ii. 438
Cacault, i. 31
Cadiz, Bishop of, ii. 425
Cadorna, General, i. 432
Cadwallader, General, ii. 288
Cahensley, ii. 331, 332
Cahour, i. 242
Caldwell, ii. 101
California, ii. 268, 285, 322
Cambridge University, ii. 29, 65, 67
Camden, Lord Lieutenant, ii. 130, 131, 132, 133, 257
Campo Formio, peace of, i. 26, 83
Camuccini, i. 225
Camus, Le, Mgr., i. 271
Canada, Church in, ii. 143; Catholics, position of in Canada, ii. 336; bigoted attitude of English government towards Canadian Catholics, ii. 337; Quebec Act, ii. 337; loyalty of Canadian Catholics and end of active persecution, ii. 338; further struggles between English government and Catholic Church, ii. 339; large numbers of Irish and Scotch settlers in Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, and Upper Canada, ii. 340; jealousy felt by some French Canadians towards Irish emigrants; French Canadians help plague-stricken Irish, ii. 340-41; progress of Church in Western and North-western Provinces, ii. 341; insurrection in Canada, ii. 341-342; increase of Catholic population and present condition of Church, ii. 343; education question in the different provinces, ii. 343-345; Papal delegate sent to Canada, ii. 345; compromise effected, ii. 346; controversy opened again in North-West Provinces and finally settled, ii. 346; religious congregations in Canada, ii. 346-347; university education in Canada, ii. 347; centres of clerical education, ii. 348
Canning, George, ii. 17, 18, 149, 154, 156, 168
Canterbury, ii. 81, 86
Cantwell, Dr., Bishop of Meath, ii. 190, 191, 194, 208
Cape Breton, ii. 340
Cape of Good Hope, ii. 381
Capel, Mgr., ii. 67
Capellari, Cardinal, i. 219. *See* Gregory XVI
Capes, John Moore, ii. 59
Capital and Labour, encyclicals of Leo. XIII. on, i. 479-80; ii. 519, *seq.*
Capponi, i. 230
Caprara, Cardinal, i. 33, 34-36; ii. 13

Capuchins, ii. 439
Caracas, Archdiocese of, and university at, ii. 366
Carbonari, condemnation of Pius VII., i. 212; of Leo XII., i. 216, 228
Cardinals, "Black and Red," i. 50, 51, 202
Garey, Stewart and Co., ii. 276
Carhampton, Lord, ii. 133
Carlile, Rev. James, ii. 185, 223, 224
Carlos, Don, i. 165; and war of succession in Spain, i. 166
Carlow College, ii. 255, 386
Carmelites, i. 270
Carmelite Sisters, ii. 311
Carolina, Queen, i. 110
Carr, Dr., archbishop of Melbourne, vice-president Maynooth, bishop of Galway, transferred to Melbourne, ii. 391; his work in Melbourne, ii. 391
Carrera, ii., 355
Carrickshock, ii. 180
Carrière, ii. 447
Carrigtwohill, ii. 181
Carrion, President, ii. 368
Carroll, Rev. John, superior of American missions, prefect apostolic, ii. 271; appointed first bishop of America, ii. 272; consecration in England, ii. 272; delegation to Canada, ii. 272; founds Georgetown, ii. 274; invites Carmelite nuns and Poor Clares, ii. 274; convokes a synod of his priests, and obtains from law courts recognition of his authority, ii. 275; petitions Holy See for establishment of more bishoprics, ii. 276; death, ii. 276; opposed lay trusteeship, ii. 280, 295,
Carroll, Charles, ii. 269, 273
Carroll, Daniel, ii. 269, 273
Cashel, ii. 119; Synod of, ii. 200-2, 240, 241
Casoni, Cardinal, i. 41, 200
Castelfidardo, battle of, i. 428
Castiglioni, Cardinal, i. 214, 218. *See* Pius VIII.
Castlepollard, ii. 180
Castlereagh, i. 209; ii. 19, 137, 140, 141, 148, 149, 158, 178
Castro, de, Bishop, i. 176
Cathedral of Westminster, ii. 70
Catherine II. of Russia, i. 183
Catholic Association, English, opposition of to diplomatic relations with Rome, ii. 197
Catholic Association, Irish, ii. 163, *sqq*. *See* Ireland; Board, Irish, strong resolution of, ii. 158, remonstrance to Rome, ii. 161
Catholic Board, English, ii. 15-23, favours veto, fifth resolution; favours Relief Bill in Parliament, ii. 154; negotiations of with Government, ii. 155; select committee of, ii. 156. *See* England
Catholic Committee, English, ii. 4-11. *See* England; Irish, ii. 105. *See* Ireland; central in Austria, i. 341
Catholic Congress in Austria, i 341.
Catholic Emancipation. *See* Ireland.
Catholic Relief Bill. *See* Ireland, England.
Catholic Poor School Committee, England, ii. 75
Catholic Education Council, England, ii. 76
Catholic Union of Great Britain, ii. 76
Catholic Truth Society, ii. 76
Catholic Reform movement, ii. 463
Catholic Social Congresses, ii. 519.
Catholic Missions. *See* Missions.
Catholic Democratic school, ii. 518
Catholic Parties, why formed, ii. 451
Catholic Party in France, i. 60-69, 232-42, 257, 263-4; ii. 448, 512
Catholic Party in Holland, i. 379
Catholic Party in Prussia, i. 282
Catholic social organisation in Switzerland, i. 353-4; in Belgium, i. 368
Catholic League, Holland, i. 378
Catholic secondary education. *See* Education
Catholic University, Louvain. *See* Louvain
Catholic University, Dublin. *See* Dublin
Catholic University, Freiburg, in Switzerland. *See* Switzerland.
Catholic University in Washington. *See* Washington
Catholic Summer School of America. *See* United States

Catholic Labour Movement, ii. 511; why Church should be interested in struggle between Capital and Labour, ii. 511; stages in Catholic Democratic movement, ii. 512; the precursors, ii. 512; two schools of thought distinguishable in further movements, ii. 513; Catholic economic movement in Germany, ii. 513 *sqq.*; Catholic movement spreads into Austria, Switzerland, France, Belgium, and English-speaking countries, ii. 516 *sqq.*; different views of Catholic economists, ii. 518; close relations between Catholic economists of different nationalities established, ii. 519; friendly attitude of Pope towards Labour question, as shown by Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*, ii. 520-521; reception of Encyclical, ii. 521; Catholic Labour Organisation in Germany, ii. 521-522; Catholic Democratic party in Austria, ii. 522; Catholic Democratic parties in Switzerland and Belgium, ii. 523-524.
Catholicae Fidei, Bull, ii. 440
Cathrein, ii. 469
Caulfield, Dr., ii. 147
Cavaignac, General, i. 236; ii. 502
Cavan, ii. 141, 231
Cavour, i. 247, 425, *et seq.*
Cecconi, i. 456
Cecilia Street (Medicine School), ii. 242-43, 250
Centralist Party, ii. 351
Centre Party, i. 301, 306, 310, 313; ii. 515, 522
Cercles Catholiques, ii. 519
Ceylon, ii. 419
Chalcedon, Council of, ii. 430
Challoner, Richard, ii. 34, 35
Chalmers, Dr., ii. 92
Chambord, Comte de, i. 252
Champagnat, L'Abbé, ii. 443
Champlain, Lake, ii. 321
Chantôme, L'Abbé, ii. 512
Chapman, Dom., O. S. B., ii. 438
Charitasverband, i. 325
Charlemagne, i. 38
Charlemont, Earl of, ii. 101, 109, 110; 111, 112, 138, 140
Charles the Great, i. 35
Charles Theodore, i. 102
Charles Edward, Prince, Pretender, ii. 86, 87
Charles II. of Spain, ii. 362
Charles III. of Spain, i. 159, 160
Charles IV. of Spain, i. 160, 161, 166
Charles VII. of Spain (Carlist), i 384
Charles X. of France, i. 58, 59, 217; ii. 446
Charles Emmanuel of Sardinia, i. 52, 207, 213
Charles Albert of Sardinia, i. 229, 420, 422; ill success against the Austrians, i. 424
Charleston, ii. 277, 287, 288
Chartered Schools, ii. 218, 222
Chateaubriand, i. 37; ii. 451, 479, 481
Chesnel, i, 442
Chester, Castle, ii. 212
Cheverus, Bishop, ii. 27
Chiaramonte, Cardinal, elected Pope, i. 30. *See* Pius VII.
Chili, political vicissitudes of, ii. 372; condition of Church during these, ii. 372; present condition of Church in reference to ecclesiastical government and education, ii. 373
China, missions in, ii. 432, 434. *See* Missions
Chisholm, ii. 143
Christchurch, diocese of, ii. 401
Christian Brothers, ii. 391
Christian Instruction, Brothers of, ii. 443
Christian Evidences, ii. 225
Christian Democracy, i. 480. *See* Catholic Labour
Christian National Church in Switzerland, i. 468
Christian Year, ii. 20
Chur, Bishop of, i. 106
Church History. *See* Studies, Ecclesiastical
"Church Times," The, ii. 74
Ciamberlani, i. 154, 155
Cilicia, patriarchate of, ii. 430
Cincinnati, diocese of, ii. 277
Cisalpine Club, ii. 11
Cistercians, Order of, ii. 438; re-establishment of Cistercian houses, ii. 438; chapter of Reformed Cistercians meets at Rome, ii. 438; order confirmed under title of "Order of Reformed Cistercians of the Strict

Cistercians, Order of—*continued* Observance"; houses in different parts of the world; order of Cistercians of Common Observance; divisions of, ii. 438
Civiltà Cattolica, i. 443-4; ii. 64, 442, 517
Civita Vecchia, i. 41
Clarendon, Lord, ii. 239, 240
Clarke, ii. 469
Clemenceau, i. 246
Clement Augustus, Archbishop of Cologne, i. 96, 97, 100; ii. 451, 457, 458
Clement, XIV., i. 210; ii. 274, 440
Clerkenwell, Prison, ii. 212
Clifford, Bishop, i. 452, 458; ii. 63
Clinton, ii. 290
Cloncurry, Lord, ii. 221
Clonfert, ii. 177
Clonliffe, College, ii. 266
Clonmel, Corporation, ii. 189, 209
Cloyne, Diocese of, ii. 380
Club, The Roman Catholic Meeting, ii. 11
Cochin, i. 447
Cockburn, Lord, ii. 92
Coimbra, i. 395; University, ii. 441, 497
Colenso, ii. 80; bishop of Natal, ii. 81
Coleraine, Academical Institute, ii. 231
Collectio Lacensis, ii. 477
Collegium Romanum, ii. 495; *Urbanum*, ii. 496
Collier, Dr., O.S.B., ii. 424
Cologne, ii., 451; Old Catholic conference at, ii. 65
Colombia, ii. 277
Colombia, church in, political vicissitudes of, ii. 363; sufferings of church and manifestations of strong anti-Catholic spirit, ii. 364; regulations of law in regard to religion and education, ii. 364; ecclesiastical government of; ii. 365
Colonial Office, ii. 381
Columbus, ii. 362
Combes, M., i. 271, 273, 274; ii. 493
Commission, Ecclesiastical, i. 46, 84, 117
Commission on Anglican Orders, ii. 73
Committee, Catholic, English. *See* England
Committee, Catholic, Irish. *See* Ireland
Committee of Public Safety, i. 23, 25
Common Council, ii. 313
Commons, House of, i, 27
Commune of Paris, i. 20; and second seige of Paris, i. 251
Compte-Rendu of Necker, i. 10
Comte, Auguste, i. 244
Concanen, Bishop, ii. 276
Concordat, of Leo X., i. 4, 56; of Pius VII. and Napoleon, i. 29, 30, 31; ratified, i. 32; terms of, i. 32-3; proclaimed in Rome and Paris, i. 34-5; organic articles, i. 35; concordat opposed, i. 36
Concordat of *Fontainebleau*, i. 51, 205
Concordat, Prussian, i. 91
Concordat, Bavarian, i. 107, 213
Concordat, Rhine Provinces, i. 114
Concordat, Belgium, i. 142, 147
Concordat, Russia and Poland, i. 194, 213
Concordat of 1753 with Spain, i. 212
Concordat, Naples, i. 213
Concordat of Würtemberg, i. 296
Concordat of Pius VII., non-acceptance of by French bishops resident in England, ii. 13
Concordat with Guatemala, ii. 355-6
Concordat with Honduras, ii. 357
Concordat with Salvador, ii. 357-8
Concordat with Nicaragua, ii. 358
Concordat with Costa Rica, ii 359
Concordat with Haiti, ii. 362
Concordat with Venezuela, ii. 365
Concordat with Ecuador, ii. 367
Condè, Prince de, i. 12
Condillac, i. 7
Confederation: of the Rhine, i. 42, 72; of Baden, i. 130; Germanic, i. 73: of Sarnen, i. 130; of Bar. i. 184; of Targovica, i. 186; of States of Central America, ii. 357, 358
Congregations. *See* Orders.
Congress of Vienna, i. 53, 72, 128, 143, 189, 208, 220; Catholic of Munich, ii. 60, 461; of Mechlin, ii. 60; Catholic Congress at Aachen, i. 323; at Vienna, i. 341

Connecticut, State of, ii. 270
Connolly, Bishop, i. 452, 458; ii. 280
Conolly, Rev. Philip, ii. 381, 384
Consalvi, Cardinal, Secretary of Conclave at Venice, i. 29, 198; goes to Paris, i. 31; his firmness, i. 32, 35 36; resigns secretaryship, i. 41; at Congress of Vienna, i. 53, 54, 55, 74; and Rhine Provinces, i. 115; early life, i. 198; diplomatic ability, i. 199; arrested by Napoleon, i. 202; liberated, i. 206; reappointed secretary, i. 207; treats with powers at London and Vienna, i. 208-9; and Leo XII. and death, i. 213
Conservative and Liberal Catholics, i. 60-64, 148, 240, *sqq.*, 419, 443, *sqq.*, 447: ii. 38, 59, 64, 460-63. *See* Ultramontane
Conservative policy of Cardinal Antonelli, i. 424
Conservative theologians, ii. 484
Constantine, Grand Duke, i. 399
Constantinople, Patriarchate of, ii. 429-30
Constitutio Dogmatica de Fide Catholica, ii. 463
Constitution, Civil, of the clergy, i. 15, 16; action of Louis XVI. condemned by Pius VI., i. 16; bishops of France and, i. 18; synod of constitutional clergy, i. 28; the Pope, Napoleon, and the constitutional bishops, i. 34; in Switzerland, i. 347
Contrat Social, Le, influence of, i. 8
Convention Act, ii. 128
Convention of Antwerp, i. 358
Convention of Vergara, i. 167
Convention on mixed marriages, i. 95; between Holy See and Grand Duchy of Baden, i. 291; with Switzerland, i. 476; with Colombia, ii. 365
Convention, the National, i. 19-25
Conventuals, ii. 439
Conwell, Bishop, ii. 281
Cooke, Captain, ii. 378
Cooke, secretary for war, ii. 129
Cookstown, Vicariate of, ii. 394
Corcoran, Dr., i. 442
Corcoran, Father, ii. 384
Corea, missions in, ii. 434. *See* Missions
Coretti, ii. 468
Cork city, ii. 209, 220; corporation, ii. 189
Cornelius, i. 464
Cornely, ii. 474
Cornoldi, ii. 467, 468
Cornwallis, Lord Lieutenant, ii. 137, 138, 140, 141, 148, 149
Correspondant, Le, i. 248, 446; ii. 460
Cortes, Donoso, i. 169, 170, 243 ii. 481
Costa Rica, Church in, continued turmoil, ii. 359; persecution, ii. 359, concordat with Holy See, ii. 359; hostility of government to religion, ii. 359; state of education, ii. 359; Apostolic delegate, ii. 359
Cotham, ii. 384
Coubé, S.J., ii, 334
Coup d'État, i. 241
Cousin, i. 66; ii. 453
Coux, de, Charles, i. 65; ii. 512
Cracow, University of, ii. 494
Crane, Dr., ii. 391
Crefeld, ii. 514
Cretet, i. 32
Crimean War, i. 195
Crispi, Signor, i. 473-4
Croix, La, i. 264, 268
Croke, Dr., ii. 401; Bishop of Auckland, Archbishop of Cashel
Crolly, Dr., Archbishop of Armagh, ii. 191, 193, 200, 225, 238
Crolly, Professor, Maynooth, ii. 486
Cromwell, ii. 268
Cruise, Dr., ii. 147
Cuba, political vicissitudes of, ii. 361; population mostly Catholic, ii. 361; dealings of American government with the Church, ii. 361; ecclesiastical government of, ii. 361; flourishing state of education, ii. 362
Cullen, Dr., ii. 197; archbishop of Armagh, ii. 200; apostolic delegate at national synod, ii. 200; attacked in Parliament, ii. 202; supports Catholic Defence Association, ii. 203; archbishop of Dublin, ii. 205; distrust of Irish Party towards, ii. 205; charges against, ii. 206; meeting with Lucas in Rome, 207, 225, 239; papal delegate to Ireland, ii. 224; at Vatican Council, i. 458; his formula for definition of papal infallibility accepted, i. 459; opposes English

Cullen, Dr.—*continued*
intrigues in Rome, ii. 197; work for Irish education, ii. 225 *sqq.*
Culloden, ii. 87
Culm, ii. 493
Curci, S. J., ii. 517
Cursus Sacræ Scripturæ, ii. 474
Curtis, Dr., ii. 165, 170
Custozza, battle of, i. 283

D

Daens, Abbé, i. 369; ii. 524
Dalberg, Prince bishop, i. 74, 107, 113
Dalgairns, ii. 39; submission to Rome, ii. 47
Daniel, i. 242
Danton, i. 21, 22, 24
Darboy, Archbishop of Paris, i. 450, 451, 454, 458, 459, 463
Darras, ii. 475
Darré, Dr. ii. 259
Daru, M., i. 463
Das Kapital, ii. 504
Das Vaterland, ii. 516
D'Alembert, i. 7
D'Azeglio, i. 230
D'Azeglio, Tapparelli, ii. 517
Dechamps, Cardinal, i. 362, 447, 450, 451, 454, 458, 483
Decurtins, Gaspard, i. 352, 353, 480; ii. 516, 523
De Ecclesia Christi (Murray), i. 448
Defenders, ii. 122, 132, 133, 134
De Harlez, ii. 481
Delahogue, Dr., ii. 259
De la Justice dans la Révolution et dans l'Église, ii. 503
Delaney, Dr. ii. 443
Delcassé, M., i. 267
Delort, Dr., ii. 259
De L'Église Gallicane, ii. 447
De Maistre, i. 57; ii. 447-48, 479
Demerara, Vicariate of, ii. 426
Demeter, Archbishop (Freiburg), i. 118, 123
Democratic League of Belgium, ii. 523
Denifle, O.P., ii. 439, 478
Denison, Archdeacon, ii. 77
Denmark, Revival and progress of Catholicity in, i. 411-13
Denvir, Dr., ii. 239
Depretis, M., i. 471, 473
Derby, Lord, ii. 212
Derry Co., ii. 136; Derry corporation, ii. 189
Derry, Dr., ii. 207
Desmoulins, i. 22
Dessalines, Emperor, ii. 362
De Sylva y Torres, Joseph, Archbishop of Goa, ii. 420
Detroit, ii. 290, 315
De Vere, Aubrey, ii. 56
Devereux, James, ii. 123
Devoisin, Bishop, ii. 446
Devoti (Canonist), i. 218
Diaz, President, ii. 350, 354
Diderot, i. 7, 173
Didiot, Professor, ii. 469, 473
Die Arbeiterfrage und Das Christenthum ii. 514
Die Katholischen Missionen, ii. 442
Dieringer, i. 462; ii. 458
Digby, St. Ann's College at, ii. 347
Dillingen, ii. 493
Dillon, Dr., ii. 146
Diocesan Free Schools, ii. 217, 230
Di Pietro, Cardinal, i. 52
Directory, i. 25; and Papal States, i. 26; Factions, i. 27; Theophilanthropists, i. 28
Disraeli, Prime Minister, ii. 212, 245
Dittrich, i. 461
Dockers' strike in London, ii. 69
Doctrinal Decision (of Belgian bishops), i. 145
Dogmatic Theology. *See* Studies, Ecclesiastical
Dolan, Father, ii. 315
Döllinger, Dr., of Munich, i. 110, 279, 287, 429, 440; on papal infallibility, i. 443 *et seq.*; i. 455, 461 *et seq.*; ii. 59, 64, 66, 461; ii. 477, 478, 481, 483
Dominicans, ii. 347, 416, 417, 430, 433; different events which seriously affected the order; work done by the order; work done in education in various parts of the world; remarkable men of the order during the nineteenth century, ii. 439
Dominican Colleges at Mosul and Jerusalem, ii. 430, 474
Dominicans in Freiburg in Switzerland, ii. 495
Dominican Nuns, ii. 394, 424, 314
Dominic, Father, Passionist, ii. 47
Dominica, Island of, ii. 427
Donatists, ii. 38, 40
Donegal, ii. 141
Donnellan, Mr., ii. 141
Doon, ii. 180

Dordrecht, Synod of, i. 153
Doria, Cardinal, i. 200
Douay, ii. 88, 92, 254
Douglass, Dr., ii. 14, 143, 146
Doutreloux, Mgr., i. 368, 369; ii. 517, 524
Dowling, Rev. Vincent, ii. 383, 385
Downside College, ii. 76, 384
Doyle, Dr. (J. K. L.), ii. 165, 174, 175, 179, 185, 190, 222, 223, 481
Drennan, ii. 116
Dresden, i. 50
Dreyfus, i. 267
Drogheda, ii. 106; Drogheda Corporation, ii. 189, 209, 217, 231
Droste-Vischering. *See* Clement Augustus
Drumcondra, ii. 245
Drummond, Thomas, ii. 183
Drumont, Edouard, i. 264
Dublin, ii. 103, 104, 107, 145, 155, 220, 386
Dublin. *See* Drs. Troy, Murray, Cullen; University. *See* Trinity College, Catholic University at. *See* Ireland and Universities
Dublin Gazette, ii. 104
Dublin Review, ii. 37, 39, 54, 59, 60, 62
Dublin Corporation, ii. 119, 189
Dubois, Archbishop, i. 4
Dubois, Bishop of New York, ii. 282, 312
Dubourg, Bishop, ii. 312
Duchesne, Mgr., i. 484; ii. 71, 73, 477, 487
Ducros, i. 27
Dufaure, i. 258
Duffy, Charles Gavan, ii. 201; Member of New Ross, ii. 203; ii. 205, 206, 207
Dufour, General, i. 136
Duigenan, ii. 125, 138
Dumouriez, General, i. 22, 140
Dunboyne, Lord, Bishop of Cork; secedes from Catholic Church: repents; dies a Catholic and leaves his Meath property to Maynooth, ii. 261–6
Dundas, ii. 118, 121, 124
Dunedin, Diocese of, ii. 401
Dungannon, ii. 231
Dungannon, Convention of, ii. 109
Dunin, von (Archbp.) i. 98, 99, 100
Dunkeld, ii. 95
Dupanloup, Abbé and Bishop, i. 238, 240, 242, 247, *et seq.*, 255, 256, 257, 259, 429-437, 441, 446, 447, 450, 451, 454, 459, 460
Duphot, General, i. 26
Dupin, i. 69; ii. 449
Durando, General, i. 422
Durham, ii. 50
Durham, Lord, ii. 341
Durham, Meetings of the Vicars at, ii. 17, 20
Duroc, Marshal, i. 44
Duruy, i. 246-249
Dutch. *See* Holland
Du Pape, i. 58

E

Eberhard, Bishop, i. 307
Ecclesiastical. *See* Commission
Ecclesiastical property in France, i. 3; revolutionary legislation and confiscation, i. 12, 13, 14, 20, 23; under concordat, i. 33; secularisation of in German States, i. 71; in Austria, i. 85; in Spain, i. 382; Portugal, i. 391; Italy, i. 436
Ecclesiastical Studies. *See* Studies
Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, ii. 51, 202, 204
Eccleston, Archbishop, ii. 297, 315
École Française (in Rome), ii. 477
École des Hautes Études (Paris), ii. 439
Ecuador, ii. 363
Ecuador, church in; political vicissitudes of, ii. 366; church at first persecuted; Garcia Moreno president, ii. 367; concordat with Holy See, ii. 367; flourishing condition of the country, ii. 367; further development of republic, ii. 368, ; murder of president and persecutions of the church revived, ii. 369
Edgbaston, ii. 63, 76, 245
Edgeworth Abbé, i. 22
Edict of Toleration, i. 76, 139, 330
Edinburgh, ii. 87, 88, 93, 95, 96
Edinburgh Review, ii. 42
Education, Ecclesiastical—FRANCE.—Provisions for Catholic education in France at time of Concordat, ii. 496; character of the new seminaries, ii. 491; University monoply and its effects on Catholic seminaries, ii. 491; religious orders in

Education, Ecclesiastical—*contd.* charge of French seminaries, ii. 492; establishment of Catholic Institutes, and benefits resulting, ii. 492; further difficulties of Catholic education in France, ii. 493. GERMANY AND AUSTRIA.—Germany—Condition of clerical education in, ii. 493. AUSTRIA.—Condition of clerical education in, ii. 494. SWITZERLAND.—Dangerous position of Catholic seminaries in, ii. 494; present condition of clerical education in, ii. 494. BELGIUM AND HOLLAND.—Condition of clerical education in, ii. 495. ITALY.—Various fortunes of Catholic colleges in Rome, ii. 495; present condition of, ii. 496; condition of seminaries in Italian dioceses, ii. 496. PORTUGAL.—Seminaries closed and when reopened under supervision of state officials, ii. 497; bishops get some control of them, ii. 497; Portuguese college in Rome, ii. 497; ENGLAND, ii. 497; SCOTLAND, ii. 497; IRELAND, ii. 253-66; UNITED STATES, seminaries in many dioceses, ii. 497; seminaries on the Continent, ii. 497; establishment of Catholic University, ii. 497; CANADA, ii. 348; MEXICO, ii. 355; COSTA RICA, ii. 360; HAITI, ii. 363; BOLIVIA, ii. 371-2; CHILI, ii, 373; PARAGUAY, ii. 373; ARGENTINA, ii. 375; BRAZIL, ii. 376-7

Education, Primary: in France, i. 65, 240, 249, 256, 260, 261, 262, 267-69, 271, 277; Bavaria, i. 108, 287, 320; Baden, i. 292, 294, 320; Prussia, i. 319-320; Hesse, i. 321; Nassau, i. 320; Würtemberg, i. 321; Saxony, i. 321; Austria, i. 85, 329, 332, 338-39; Hungary, i. 340; Switzerland, i. 132, 351, 354-55; Belgium, i. 151, 361-67, 371; Holland, i. 375, 376; Spain, i. 351; Portugal, i. 395; Denmark, i. 412; Norway, i. 415; Sweden, i. 417; England, ii. 74-5; Scotland, ii. 97; Ireland, ii. 216-30; The United States, ii. 309-19; Canada, ii. 343-47; Mexico, ii. 395; Honduras, ii. 357; Nicaragua, ii. 358; Costa Rica,

Education, Primary—*continued* ii. 359; Haiti, ii. 363; Colombia, ii. 364; Venezuela, ii. 366; Ecuador, ii. 367-69; Peru, ii. 370; Bolivia, ii. 371-73; Chili, ii. 373; Paraguay, ii. 370; Uruguay, ii. 374; Argentina, ii. 375; Brazil, ii. 377; Mauritius Islands, ii. 425; Malta, ii, 425; Australia, ii. 404-10; New Zealand, ii. 410

Education, Secondary: in France, i. 65, 66, 237-40, 249, 260, 271; Austria, i. 85, 329, 339-40: Hungary, ii. 340; Prussia, i. 321; Bavaria, i. 321; Baden, i. 321; Switzerland, i. 32; Belgium, i. 358, 365, 371; Holland, i. 377; Spain, i. 387; Portugal, i. 395; Denmark, i. 412; Norway, i. 415; Sweden, i. 417; England, ii. 76; Scotland, ii. 97; Ireland, ii. 230-5; United States, ii. 319; Canada, ii. 346-7; Mexico, ii. 355; Honduras, ii. 357; Nicaragua, ii. 359; Costa Rica, ii. 360; Cuba, ii. 362 Colombia, ii. 365; Ecuador, ii. 367-9; Peru, ii. 370; Bolivia, ii. 371-2; Chili, ii. 373: Paraguay, ii. 373; Uruguay, ii. 374; Argentina, ii. 375-6; Brazil, ii. 377; Mauritius Islands, ii. 405; Malta, ii. 425; Australia, ii. 411; New Zealand, ii. 411

Education, University: in France, i. 57, 64-5, 256-7, 260; Germany, 322-24; Austria, i. 340; Hungary, i. 341; Switzerland, i. 352; Belgium, i. 372; Holland, i. 377; Spain, ii. 496; Portugal, i. 395; England, ii. 61-2, 67; Ireland, ii. 235-52; United States, ii. 320-22; Canada, ii. 347-48; Australia, ii. 411; New Zealand, ii. 411

Egan, Bishop, ii. 276, 280

Egan, Mr., ii. 120

Egmont, Count, i. 153

Ehrard, Professor, ii. 476

Eichorn, ii. 470 471

Eichstätt, ii. 493

Elba, i. 54

Elephant Tavern, Essex Street, ii. 105

Elliott, Father, ii. 333

Elvenich, ii. 457

Emancipation, Catholic, i. 218. *See* Ireland

Émery, Abbé, i. 46, ii. 273, 447

Émigrés, i. 12, 19, 20; *Émigré*, bishops and concordat, i. 33
Emmitsburg, Mount St. Mary's College, ii. 277
Empire, French, i. 38
Empire, Holy Roman, i. 42, 55, 70
Encyclical of Pius IX. to French bishops, 1853, i. 243; *Inter Multiplices* i. 244; *Nullis Certé*, i. 248; *Nobilissima Gallorum Gens*, i. 263; Encyclical to French Catholics, i. 266; Leo XIII., Encyclical to Bavarian bishops, i. 317; Pius IX. *Etsi multa luctuosa*, i. 350; *Ex quo die arcano*, i. 374; Encyclical to Catholics of Spain, i. 386; Encyclical to bishops of Portugal, i. 396; *Grande Munus*, i. 408, 481; *Respicientes ea omnia*, i 433; *Quanta Cura*, i. 440-41; Encyclicals of Leo XIII., 478 *et seq.*; *Orientalium Dignitas Ecclesiarum*, i. 481; *Ad Anglos*, i. 482; *Providentissimus Deus*, i. 485; ii. 473-4; *Apostolicae Curae*, ii. 73: *Inter plurimos*, i. 485; *Dominici Gregis*, i. 487; *Multa praeclare*, ii. 419; *Qui pluribus ab hinc annis*, ii. 419; *Providentissimus Deus*, ii. 473-4; *Pascendi Gregis*, ii. 463, 480
Encyclopedia, i. 7, 8, 37
Enfantine, ii. 502
Engels, Frederick, ii. 503, 505, 509
England, Bishop, ii. 284, 296, 297, 312, 383
England, Church in, ii. 1; Catholicity in England at passing of Relief Bill (1778), ii. 1; Scotch opposition to Relief Bill, Gordon Riots; ii. 3, 4; Catholic Committee formed, ii. 4; "Protestation" and negotiations with Government, ii. 6; New Catholic Oath, ii. 6; "Protesting Catholic Dissenters," ii. 6; Catholic Committee "Blue Books" of and petition to Propaganda new oath condemned again, ii. 8; bishops oppose Relief Bill, ii. 8; new Relief Bill becomes law, ii. 9, 10; mediation, ii. 10; Catholic Committee dissolved and Cisalpine Club formed, ii. 12; French clergy resident in England refuse Concordat of Pius VI., ii. 13; influence of French clergy on
England, Church in—*continued* English people, ii. 13; English seminaries, ii. 14; Catholic Board formed and deputation of, ii. 15; "Fifth Resolution," ii. 15; English Catholic petition to Parliament, ii. 16; "Fifth Resolution" passed, ii. 16; defeat of Catholic petition in Lords and Commons, ii. 17; meeting of English vicars at Durham, ii. 17; Catholic Relief Bill, ii. 18-20; *Brief Memorial*, ii. 19; meeting of vicars apostolic of England and Scotland, ii. 20; English vicars, negotiations of, with Rome, ii. 21; Catholic Board, address of, to the Pope, ii. 22; letter of Pope to English vicars, ii. 22; Anglican Church, condition of, ii. 24 *et seq*; Liberal school, ii. 25; Peel election, ii. 28; Reform movement viewed with alarm, ii. 28; measure for suppression of Irish bishoprics and sermon on *National Apostasy*, ii. 30
England and France, i. 8, 9; and *Émigré clergy*, i. 21; and Napoleon, i. 27, 43; and Portugal, i. 175
English Catholics, position of, in period following Emancipation, ii. 34; Anglican bishops repudiate interpretation of Thirty-nine Articles by Tractarians, and fraternise with Lutherans, ii. 43; moderate and extreme sections of Tractarians split, ii. 44; *Ward's Ideal of a Christian Church*, published, ii. 45; Convocation summoned and *Ideal of a Christian Church* condemned, ii. 46; secession from the Anglican Church
English Catholics, position of, at re-establishment of hierarchy, ii. 49 *et seq.*; storm of opposition against the Papal brief, and letter from the Prime Minister to bishop of Durham denouncing it, ii. 50; *Ecclesiastical Titles Bill* passed, ii. 51; Hereford bishopric, ii. 52, 53; subjection of Anglican Church clearly shown by appointment of Rev. Mr. Gorham, ii. 53; bill of bishop of London thrown out, ii. 54;

English Catholics—*continued*
rival parties in High Church and secessions to Rome, ii. 55; Oratory opened in London, ii. 55; dissensions amongst English Catholics, ii. 57; English bishops decide against chapter of Westminster, ii. 58; Liberal Catholics and *Rambler*, ii. 59; *Rambler* is changed into *Home and Foreign Review*, but is condemned by the bishops, ii. 60; stormy discussions between Liberal and Conservative Catholics, ii. 60; Anglican bishops attend Old Catholic conference at Cologne, ii. 65; Old Catholic bishopric established in England, 65; stormy feeling in England against Papal Infallibility increased by Gladstone's pamphlet, *The Vatican Decrees in their bearing on Civil Allegiance*; attacks continued in *Quarterly Review*, *Vaticanism*, *Rome and the Newest Fashions in Religion*; idea of a union between Catholics and Anglicans gaining ground, ii. 71; Anglicans disconcerted by Papal condemnation of Anglican Orders; conflicts regarding primary schools, ii. 75; Education Act of 1902; its advantage to Catholics, ii. 75
English College at Rome, ii. 35
Enlightenment, Party of, i. 76, 104. *See Aufklärung*
Ennis, ii. 217, 231
Enniskillen, ii. 231
Erasmus Smith schools, ii. 221, 231
L'Ère Nouvelle, ii. 512
Erfurt Programme, ii. 506
Errington, Bishop, friend of Wiseman, and appointed coadjutor, ii. 57; quarrels with the cardinal, ii. 58; supports chapter of Westminster, ii. 58; retires into private life, ii. 59
Errors of Romanism, ii. 224
Errors, Theological and Developments; Jansenism practically dead at beginning of the nineteenth century, yet still exercised an influence in France and Italy, ii. 444-445; Gallicanism under Napoleon I. and the Restoration, ii. 445, 447; decline of Gallicanism; causes for, ii. 447
Errors—*continued*
et seq.; favourable conditions for reception of Gallicanism in Holy Roman, Empire, ii. 449; movement towards a German National Church defeated, ii. 450; causes leading to downfall of anti-Papal movement in Germany, ii. 450-451. FAITH AND REASON.—Different lines of defence adopted by Catholic apologists, ii. 451-452; rise of Traditional school; different views held by different members of the school, ii. 452 *et seq.*; rise of Fideism, ii. 453. ONTOLOGISTS.—Fundamental doctrines of, ii. 455; opposition of Jesuits to, ii. 455; later condemnation of Ontologism, ii. 455, 456. GERMAN SCHOOLS, ii. 456.—Difference between German school and Traditionalism or Ontologism; rise and progress, condemnation and disappearance of the Hermesian party, ii. 456 *et seq.*; Günther's theory and opponents, ii. 458; condemnation of, ii. 459; Ronge's movement; founds sect of German Catholics, ii. 459; opposed by civil and ecclesiastical authorities, ii. 460. LIBERALS AND CONSERVATIVES.—Two schools of Catholic thought in England, France and Germany, ii. 460-461; crisis at congress of Munich, ii. 461; congress of Mechlin held, ii. 461. INTERVENTION OF AUTHORITY.—Middle course of Catholic Church between Traditionalism and Rationalism, ii. 462; new stage in history of Papacy entered in with definition of dogma of Immaculate Conception, ii. 462; the Syllabus, *Quanta Cura*; all disputes finally settled at Vatican Council, ii. 463. LATER DEVELOPMENTS.—Errors practical rather than dogmatic; character, principles of, *Americanism*, and condemnation of Modernism, ii. 463-464
Esmonde, Sir Thomas, ii. 160
Espartero, General, i. 168-9, 170, 382
Esquisse d'une philosophie, ii. 453
Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de religion, ii. 452

Essay on Development, ii. 48, 483
Estate, General Convocation, assembly and composition of, i. 10
Estate, Third, i. 5, 11
Esztergom, ii. 469
Ett, Kaspar, ii. 487
Eudist Fathers, ii. 348
Europe, Northern, Church in, i. 411 *sqq.*
Eutychian Controversy, ii. 39 *sqq.*
Evangelical Party in England, ii. 24
Ewald, ii. 470
Eyre, Dr., vicar of Hexham and Newcastle, ab. of Glasgow, ii. 94, 95

F

Faber, Father, ii. 39, 49, 55
Fabian Society, ii. 510
Fabris, i. 225
Falk, Dr., i. 304, 310, 319
Falloux, M., i. 237-38, 447; ii. 460
Farges, M., ii. 469
Faribault school controversy, ii. 318
Fathers of Holy Cross, ii. 347
Fathers of Holy Ghost, ii. 416, 427, 442.
Faure, M. Felix (President), i. 266
Fawcett's Act for the abolition of religious tests in Trinity College, ii. 249
Fayet, Mgr., i. 235
Febronius and Febronianism, i. 74, 79, 98, 101, 112, 113, 330; ii. 450
Federal Pact, Switzerland, i. 126, 130, 133, 136
Federalist Party, ii. 351
Felinski, Archbishop, i. 403
Fenwick, Bishop, ii. 288, 296, 312
Ferdinand VII. of Spain, i. 210, 161
Ferdinand of Tuscany, i. 105
Ferdinand II. of Austria, i. 424
Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg, i. 180, 383
Ferdinand, Prince of Bulgaria, i. 407
Fermanagh, ii. 136
Ferns, Diocese of, ii. 380
Ferrata, Mgr., i. 476
Ferris, Dr., ii. 259
Ferry, Jules, i. 257, 260, 261
Fesch, Cardinal, i. 38, 45, 46, 55
Fessler, Bishop, i. 448; ii. 476
Feuillants, i. 19
Feye, Prof., i. 442
Ffoulkes, Edmund S., i. 448
Fiala, Mgr., i. 351
Fichte, ii. 453
Fielding, Lord, ii. 55
Fingall, ii. 129, 140, 150, 151, 152, 260
Fingerlos, Mathew, i. 104
Fitzgerald, Bishop, i. 459
Fitzgerald, Vesey, ii. 168, 169
Fitzgibbon, Chancellor, ii. 119, 121, 124, 125, 132, 137, 138
Fitzsimmons, ii. 273
Fitzwilliam, Earl, ii. 128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 256, 257
Flaget, Bishop, ii. 276, 296, 314
Fleming, Bishop, ii. 349
Fleming, Father David, ii. 73
Fliegende Blätter fur katholische Kirchenmusik, ii. 488
Flocon, M., i. 233
Flood, Henry, ii. 101, 109, 110, 111, 112, 138
Florida, ii. 268, 322
Flynn, Father, Cist., ii. 381, 387
Foisset, i. 447
Fontainebleau, Concordat of, i. 50, 205; Treaty of, i. 175
Fontana, Cardinal, ii. 222
Fontenelle, i. 7
Forbes, bishop of Brechin, ii. 77
Fornari, ii. 455
Fortnightly Review, ii. 518
Foster Speaker, ii. 101, 124, 138, 140
Fourier, Charles, ii. 502
Foyle College, ii. 231
France: Revolution in, i. 1; absolutism in, i. 1; pre-Revolution government of, i. 2; division of population, i. 3; clergy of, i. 3, 4; nobles of, 1, 4, 5; peasantry of, i. 5; France and England, i. 8, 9; National Assembly of, i. 10, 11; Estates General, i. 10; Revolutionary constitution, i. 12; France and Portugal, i. 174 *et seq.*; France intervenes in the Papal States, i. 222; Second Republic, Louis Napoleon President, i. 236, 237; General Assembly, i. 235; Educational Legislation, i. 238-39; Napoleon III. Emperor, i. 240; Education law and divisions amongst the Catholics, 240 *et seq.*; rationalistic and infidel influences,

France: Revolution in—*continued* 240 *et seq.*; spread of infidelity, 244–246, 259; Napoleon III. and hostility to the Church, i. 247, 249; Franco-Prussian War and overthrow of the Empire, i. 250; the Third Republic, i. 251, 253, 255; the *Commune*, i. 253; anti-religious measures, i. 254, 260 *et seq.*; episcopal disunion, i. 259; Catholic disunion, i. 263, 269; anti-Catholic *bloc*, i. 267; embassy to Vatican suppressed, i. 272, 274; Associations Bill i. 269; expulsion and suppression of religious, i. 271; closing of Catholic schools, i. 272; President Loubet visits King of Italy in Rome, i. 273; separation of Church and State, i. 274; France and Vatican Council, i. 444; dogma of Infallibility, i. 463; France, the Third Republic and Leo XIII., i. 478; clergy of France in pre-Revolution period, i. 3; numbers, wealth, and revenue of, i. 3; state control and royal patronage, i. 4; lives and character, i. 4; and Estates General, i. 10; and National Assembly, i. 11; revolution and influence of, i. 10; and Civil Constitution, i. 15, 16, 17, 18; Jurors and non-Jurors, i. 18, 21; and Legislative Assembly, i. 19; Reign of Terror, i. 20; *Emigré* clergy, i. 21; National Convention and Directory, i. 22; Constitutional Clergy, i. 28; concordat, i. 32; French bishops, Napoleon and Pius VII., 47, 204; clergy and Monarchy of July, i. 60
Francia, Dictator, ii. 373
Francis I., i. 56, 213, 216
Francis II. (dissolves Holy Roman Empire), i. 72, 83
Francis Joseph, Emperor of Austria, i. 88, 426, 477
Francis II. of Naples, i. 428
Franciscan Brothers, ii. 315
Franciscan Sisters, ii 314
Franciscans, Order of, ii. 319, 347, 386, 416, 417, 428, 430, 433, 439
Frankfort Assembly, i. 73, 114, 116, 278; Conference of, i. 115
Franklin, Benjamin, ii. 271
Fransoni, Cardinal, ii. 196, 197, 310
Franzelin, Cardinal, i. 453, 459, 484
Frayssinous, Mgr., i. 57, 68; ii. 446, 481
Frauenbund, i. 326
Frederick II., Emperor, i. 312
Frederick the Great, i. 89 *sqq.*
Frederick William III. of Prussia, i. 90 *sqq.*
Frederick William IV. of Prussia, i. 100 *sqq.*
Freemasons, i. 76, 152, 163–64, 174, 175, 216, 259, 296, 357, 390, 392, 472, 473; in Mexico, ii. 350–51; in Brazil, ii. 376
Freiburg, in Breisgau, i. 121 *sqq*; ii. 493. *See* University of
Freiburg in Switzerland, i. 352; ii. 494, 495, 516. *See* University of
French clergy in England, ii. 11–13
French, Dr., ii. 147
French, Sir Thomas, ii. 123
French, Lord, ii. 150, 153
Freppel, Mgr., i. 264
Frère-Orban, i. 358, 359, 361, 365
Freycinet, M., i. 261
Froude, R. H., ii. 26, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 36, 38
Fuchs, i. 130
Fulda, ii. 493
Fulda, Bishop of, resists state, i. 117; meeting of German bishops proclaim Dogma of Infallibility, i. 460
Funk, Professor, ii. 476, 477

G

Gabrielli, Cardinal, i. 200
Gaduel, Abbé, i. 243
Gäeta, ii. 49
Gahan, Fr., O.S.A., ii. 261
Gainet, M., ii. 480
Gallican, Articles, i. 36, 57
Gallicanism (of Restoration), i. 57, 61, 243. *See* Errors Theological
Galloway, ii. 95
Galway Corporation, ii. 189, 217, 231
Gamarra, President, ii. 369
Gambetta, i. 249, 255, 257, 265, 272, 472
Gardellini, ii. 487
Gardiner, ii. 108
Garibaldi, i. 428, 430, 431

Garnier, ii. 472
Garrucci ii. 476.
Gasparri, ii. 73
Gasquet, Dom, ii. 73, 438, 478
Gaume, Abbé, i. 242
Gay, M., i. 442
Geay, Mgr., i. 271
Geddes, ii. 469
Geissel, von., Archbishop, i. 279, 281
Geneva, i. 126; International conference at, ii. 505
General Assembly, Scotland, ii. 88.
Genga, Della, Cardinal, i. 214. *See* Leo XII.
Génin, M., i. 66
Genoa, ii. 416
Geoghegan, Fr., ii. 390, 392, 394
George II., ii. 138
George III., ii. 3, 149
George IV., ii. 163, 170
George's Sound, Vicariate of, ii. 389
Geraldton, Vicariate of, ii. 390, 393
Gerbet, M., i. 60; ii. 448, 453
German Catholics and Infallibility, i. 445, 461 *et seq.*; schism of Old Catholics, i. 464 *et seq.*; clergy in Germany, i. 70. *See Kulturkampf*
German States, wars of Austria and Prussia, i. 70; disorganisation of, i. 71; Confederation of the Rhine, i. 71; end of Holy Roman Empire, i. 72; Church in, i. 73, 74, 278-280. *See* Prussia, Bavaria; Revolution and Church, i. 278; General Assembly of German Catholics, i. 279; North German Confederation, i. 283; Kulturkampf, i. 300 *et seq.*; German Empire established, i. 300; "May Laws," i. 304; peace negotiations and end of, i. 311
Germanic Confederation, i. 73
Germany, Education, Religious Orders, and Catholic Organisation, i. 319 *et seq.*
Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters, ii. 467
Gesellenverein, i. 325
Ghent, Conference at, ii. 505
Giarves, Mgr., ii. 431
Gilbert, Mgr., i. 253, 257, 259, 441, 442
Gibbons, Cardinal, ii. 69, 328, 520
Gibney, Dr., ii. 389
Gibson, Dr., ii. 7, 8, 16
Giesebrecht, Prof., i. 287
Gihr, ii. 487
Gil Garcia, Archbishop, i. 458
Gillis, Dr., ii. 93
Ginoulhiac, Bishop, i. 459
Gioberti, Vincenzo, i. 229, 422, 440; ii. 455
Giolotti, i. 474
Giovanni, ii. 455
Girard, i. 132
Girondists, i. 22, 23, 24
Giustiniani, Cardinal, i. 219
Gladstone, W. E., ii. 38, 48, 54, 55, 64, 65, 66, 73, 77, 212, 213, 214, 247
Glaire, M., ii. 472
Glasgow Synod, ii. 88; Glasgow, ii. 91, 95
Glengary, ii. 340
Gnesen-Posen, i. 92, 98
Goa, Archbishop of, ii. 418 *sqq.*; Schism of, 418 *sqq.*
Gobat, Bishop of Jerusalem, ii. 52
Gobel, Constitutional Archbishop, i. 17, 18, 23
Goderich, Lord, ii. 168
Godoy, i. 160
Godsdienstvriend, i. 156
Gonzalez, Cardinal, ii. 439, 467
Goold, Dr., ii. 390, 391
Good Shepherd Nuns, ii. 391
Gordon, ii. 73
Gordon, Dr., ii. 89
Gordon, Lord George, ii. 3
Gorham, Rev. Mr., Rector, ii. 53-55
Görres, i. 98, 110; ii. 451
Görresgesellschaft, ii. 477
Gotha Programme, ii. 506
Goulbourn, ii. 165; Diocese of, ii. 394; Bishop of, ii. 397
Gousset, Cardinal, i. 243; ii. 486
Graf, ii. 470
Graffin, ii. 476
Grafton, Diocese of, ii. 395
Graham, Sir James, ii. 236, 237, 238
Graigue-na-managh, ii. 179
Granada, ii. 496
Grant, Dr., ii. 63
Grandmaison, ii. 517
Gratry, Père, i. 244, 245, 454, 463
Grattan, Henry, ii. 102, 109, 110, 120, 124, 126, 128, 129, 132, 135, 138, 140, 150, 153, 154, 155, 156, 162, 256, 257
Gratz, University of, ii. 494
Gray, Dr. Metropolitan, ii. 80, 81
Gray, Dr. V. A., ii. 94
Gray, Sir John, ii. 211
Greece, Catholicity in, i. 409

Greek, Catholics of the Greek rite, i. 188 *et seq.*
Gregory XVI., i. 62; on mixed marriages, i. 88, 95, 98, 119; German bishops, i. 117, 118, 123; and Liberalism in Switzerland, i. 131; and Spain, 168-9; and Portugal, i. 180; and Polish bishops, i. 192; persecution of church in Russia under Nicholas I., i. 194; early life and election, i. 219; reform in Papal States, i. 222, 224; policy and character of, i. 223, 224, 231; *L'Avenir*, i. 223; condemnation of Hermes, i. 223; condemnation of Abbé Bautain, i. 224; Poland, i. 226; Louis Philippe, i. 227; Italian unity, i. 231; death, i. 231; ii. 239, 264, 265, 351, 364, 401; creates vicariates in India, ii. 419; 420 434, 453, 462, 492
Gregorian University, ii. 496
Gregoire, Abbé and Constitutional Bishop, i. 18, 34
Gregorio, di Cardinal, i. 219
Greith, Bishop, i. 344, 456, 458
Grey, Earl, ii. 181
Grey, Lord, ii. 15, 152
Grey, Sir George, ii. 226
Grey, Sisters, ii. 341
Grévy, M., i. 259, 260, 263
Griffiths, Dr., ii. 421
Griver, Dr., ii. 389
Grosse Island, ii. 340
Guarantees, Law of, i. 433, 471, 472
Guardian, The, ii. 74
Guatemala, Political vicissitudes in, ii. 355; persecution of Catholic Church in; concordat with Pope and persecution again, ii. 355, 356
Guéranger, Dom, i. 68, 69; ii. 449, 486, 487, 489
Guidi, O. P., ii. 439
Guizot, i. 65, 66, 67, 171
Günther, ii. 458, 459
Gury, i. 345; ii. 486
Gutberlet, ii. 469

H

Habeas Corpus Act, ii. 109, 135
Haberl, ii. 488
Haberlin, i. 112
Habsburg, House of, i. 70, 159
Hague, Conference at, ii. 505
Haiti and San Domingo, Church in, ii. 362; political vicissitudes of, ii. 362; concordat with Holy See, ii. 362; state of Church, ii. 363; state of education, ii. 363; state of Church in San Domingo, ii. 363
Halifax, ii. 343, 348
Halifax, Lord, ii. 71, 74
Hamilton, ii. 128, 129
Hampden, Dr., ii. 33, 52-53, 77
Hand, Father, ii. 264
Haneberg, ii. 461
Harbour Grace, diocese of, ii. 349
Harcourt, Duke of, i. 423
Hardenberg, i. 209
Hardwicke, Lord, ii. 149, 260
Harmel, Léon, i. 479; ii. 517
Harold, Father, ii. 379, 399
Hartford Convention, ii. 286
Haspinger, i. 107
Havana, diocese of, ii. 361, 362
Havet, M., i. 245
Hay, George, Dr., ii. 87, 88, 89 90
Haydn, ii. 487
Hayes, Father, ii. 160, 161
Hayes, Father, O.P., ii. 428
Hebron, ii. 516
Hecker, Father, ii. 294, 333
Hefele, Bishop i. 442, 458, 460; ii. 478, 483
Hegel, i. 244; ii. 456
Heidelberg, University of, ii. 513
Heilbronner, ii. 327
Heine, ii. 506
Helena, i. 54
Helleputte, ii. 523
Helvetic Constitution, i. 125
Hemmer, ii. 476
Henry VIII., ii. 217
Herbert, Lord, of Cherbury, i. 7
Herdt, de, ii. 487
Hergenröther, Prof. and Cardinal, i. 323, 442, 455, 484; ii. 475
Hermes, Professor, i. 96; condemned, i. 223, 440; ii. 456, 462
Herrera, President, ii. 352
Herzegovina. *See* Bosnia, i. 407
Herzog, i. 127, 346, 347, 467, 468
Hesse, Grand Duchy of, i. 111, 297, 316; ii. 513
Hettinger, i. 442; ii. 481
Heydekamp, Bishop, i. 465
Hibernian Military School, ii. 219

Hibernian Marine School, ii. 219
Hilgers, Prof., i. 462, 464; ii. 458
Hippisley, Sir John, ii. 143, 144, 146, 150
Hirn, i. 143
History ecclesiastical. *See* Studies ecclesiastical
History of the Councils (Hefele), ii. 477
Hitze, Canon, ii. 515
Hobart, ii. 385; diocese of, ii. 386, 399; archdiocese of, ii. 400
Hobart, Bishop of, ii. 396, 397
Hobart, Chief Secretary, ii. 115, 125, 126
Hobart University, ii. 411
Hobbes, i. 7
Hofer, i. 84, 107
Hohenlinden, battle of, i. 28, 84
Hohenlohe, Cardinal, i. 287, 288, 302, 444, 455
Hohenzollern, Joseph, i. 92
Holland, Church in, i. 139, 152; anti-Spanish revolt and Catholic persecution, i. 153; republic, Church and State, i. 154; hostility of William I., i. 155; concordat, i. 156; favour and hostility of William II., i. 156, 158, 373; hierarchy re-established—strife of parties, i. 158, 374; school laws, i. 375, 376; Progress of the Church under William III., i. 375, 377; Catholic League and social programme, i. 378
Holy Ghost Fathers, ii. 324
Holy Land, Franciscan Guardian of, ii. 429
Home and Foreign Review, ii. 60, 62
Honduras, ii. 356–7
Hôtel Dieu (Montreal), ii. 288
Howard, John. ii. 218
Hug, ii. 480
Hughes, Dr., ii. 283, 289, 312, 313
Hulst, Mgr. D', i. 257; ii. 473
Humbert, General, ii. 136
Humbert, King of Italy, i. 475
Hummelauer, ii. 474
Hungary and Joseph II., i. 80, 81; separated from Austria, i. 88; Church in Hungary, i. 336–338
Hurter, ii. 476, 483
Hussey, Dr., first President of Maynooth, ii. 257, 258, 259
Hyacinth, Père, i. 349, 446, 461, 469
Hyndham, ii. 510
Hynes, Dr., ii. 427

I

Iceland, the Church in, i. 413
Illinois, State of, ii 285
Illuminati, i. 80, 112. *See* Aufklärung
Immaculate Conception, defined, i. 439
Imola, i. 30
Indemnity Act, ii. 128, 135
Independence, American war of, ii. 101, 337
Independent Labour Party, ii. 510
India, missions in, ii. 418–21. *See* missions
Indian Missions, ii. 322 *sqq.*
Indianopolis Convention, ii. 329, 509
Infallibility: definition of, doctrine mooted, i. 443; Döllinger leads opposition in Germany, i. 445; attitude of Catholics generally, 447; Döllinger and opposition party, 450-9; promulgation of dogma, 460; post-conciliar attitude of bishops and governments, 460-9; protest of clergy and lay professors of Munich, 461–4; resistance at Bonn, 462; schism in Germany, 464; hostility in Austria and Switzerland, 467-9; in Italy, 471 *et seq.*; controversy on, in Italy, France, Germany: Veuillot and *Civiltà* School in favour of the dogma; Döllinger and Munich School against it; each party had followers in England, ii. 64; dogma defined, ii. 65, and reception in England, 66
Inglis, Sir Robert, ii. 237
Innocent X., i. 70
Innsbruck, ii. 319, 494
Inquisition abolished in Spain, i. 162, 163; in Portugal, 177
Insermentés, i. 18
Institute of Charity, ii. 455
Institutions, Liturgiques, ii. 486
Institutiones, Philosophicae, ii. 469
Insurrection Act, ii. 135
International Association of Workingmen, ii. 504

International Scientific Congress, ii. 519
Iowa, ii. 290
Ireland, Archbishop, ii. 317–18
Ireland, Church in: repeal of penal laws, ii. 99-104; dissensions amongst different sections of Catholic body, 104; Irish Catholics assured of King's protection, 104; Catholic Committee formed, 105; addresses presented to King by General Catholic Committee and Catholic gentry, 105; Catholic Committee's dissensions and dissolution, 105-6; movements towards emancipation of Catholics, 106-7; second Catholic Committee formed, 107; Relief Bill passed, 108; opposition to English control of Irish parliament, 109; Catholics warmly support Opposition, but leaders of Opposition not anxious for Catholic Emancipation, 110; parliamentary reform discussed, 111; Catholic franchise defeated by a ruse at Volunteer's convention, 112; growth of democratic spirit in Ireland, 115; Catholic Committee's unsuccessful efforts, 115-6; union between extremists, of Opposition and mercantile section of Catholic committee, 116; United Irishmen, 117; Catholic Committee's dissensions regarding expediency of union with Dissenters, 117; opposition of pensioners and placemen to Relief Bill for Irish Catholics, 118; Catholic Relief Bill passed, 119; active efforts of democratic section of Catholic committee defeated in Parliament, 120; closer union of Catholics and Dissenters, 120-1; Catholic Committee takes steps to become more representative, 121; defiant attitude of Catholics towards Government, 121–2; Catholic convention summoned, and its work, 122-3; good results of moderation of convention, and reception of Irish delegates by King, 124; Relief Bill passed, its nature, 125-7; unsettled state of country, 128; leaders of United Irishmen arrested, appointment of Earl Fitzwilliam as Lord Lieutenant, 128; dismissal of Earl Fitzwilliam, determination of Government to force on the Union, 130-1; efforts of Government to stir up bigotry in country, disturbed state in consequence, Peep of Day Boys, origin of and policy, 132; Defenders, origin and policy, 133; illegal action of Government towards, 133; union between Dissenters and United Irishmen, 134; disapproval of Catholic bishops and clergy, 134; extreme measures of Parliament towards Irish Catholics, 135; futile insurrection, 136; question of Union mooted, 137; efforts of Government to win support of Irish Catholics, 137-8; attitude of Irish Catholics towards Irish Parliament, 138; attitude of Catholic peers, men of property, and prominent ecclesiastics towards Union; attitude of general body of people, 139-40; bribery by the Government, 141; FROM UNION TO EMANCIPATION.—Efforts of English government to control Catholic Church in Ireland, ii. 142 *et seq.*; proposal to pay clergy and control nomination of bishops, 144; negotiations with the Pope, 144; bishops oppose royal control of episcopal elections, 145; government continued to urge state endowment of Church, 145-6; Maynooth trustees make some concessions to Government, 147; government resolves to carry through state-payment of clergy, 148; open opposition of Government to Catholic Emancipation, 149; insincerity of Pitt, 149; petition of Catholic Committee to government, and misrepresentation of bishops' views on veto question, 151; publication of *Letter to an Irish Priest*, 152; Irish bishops decide against the veto and are supported by laity, 152; another petition of Catholic Committee rejected, 153; new Relief Bill, 154; efforts of English Protestants to ensure loyalty

Ireland, Church in—*continued*
of Irish Catholics, 155; refusal of Irish ecclesiastics to accept rescript of Quarantotti, 157; Irish bishops send representatives to Rome, 158; Pope receives them kindly, but political state of Europe unfavourable to them, 158; conditions laid down by Pope for securing Emancipation, 158-9; opposition in Ireland; Irish laity send representatives to Rome, 160; departure of Irish representatives from Rome, and letter of Pope to Irish bishops, 160-1; continuation of contest in Ireland, 161; decline of Catholic cause in Parliament, 162; decline of Catholic Committee, 163; Catholic Association established, 164; its spread, 164; suppression of Catholic Association; rejection of Relief Bill, 165-6; Catholic Association re-established and Waterford election won, 166-7; movement attracts attention on the Continent, 167; hostile attitude of new Government to Emancipation and opposition of Catholic Association to Government, 168-9; victory at Clare election, 169; disturbed state of country, Government alarmed, 170; and admits necessity of Emancipation, but King opposed to it, 170; Catholic Association dissolved, 171; Emancipation Act passed, its terms, 171–2; mode of conducting episcopal elections settled, 172. FROM EMANCIPATION TILL THE DISESTABLISHMENT.—"New Reformation" movement, ii. 174, changed policy of Catholic clergy, 175; condition of Established Church in Ireland, 176–7; of Presbyterian Church, 177; assessment of tithes on Catholics, 178; burden of tax on small Catholic farmers, 178; disturbances begin, 179; amendment of Tithe Composition Act, and continuance of disturbance, 180; Irish Reform Bill, nature of, 181; passing of Coercion Bill, amendment of bill regarding Church cess and continuation of disturbance in Ireland, 181; Tithe Bill rejected, and fearful disturbances ensue, 182; Government abandons Tithes Commutation Bill, 182-3; fresh disturbances, and finally Tithes Commutation Bill becomes law; distress of Irish people, its cause; steps taken by Government, 185; Commission appointed, 185; remedies suggested, 186; "Poor Law Relief Bill" passed, 186; workhouses unpopular, 187; their working condemned by Irish bishops, 187-8; corruption and intolerance in Ireland, 189; Irish Municipal Reform Bill dropped, but a reform measure subsequently passed, 189; Repeal agitation began anew, and supported by bishops, 190; English intrigues in Rome regarding archbishopric of Tuam, 191; dissension caused by Charitable Bequests Bill, 191-3; Irish bishops divided on question of National Schools and Queen's Colleges, 191; leaders arrested and Repeal agitation broken, 193-4; changed attitude of Catholic bishops and clergy, 194; Irish bishops reject state payment of clergy, 195; negotiations of English Government with Rome, 196; English scheme overthrown, 198; new suggestions for pacifying Ireland, 198; dissensions between Old Ireland and Young Ireland parties, 198-9; Queen's College, and conduct of Irish landlords condemned at National Synod, 200–1; reasons for bishops' action and formation of Tenants' League, 201; Ecclesiastica. Titles Bill, 202; Catholic Defence Association formed, 203; result of election of 1852 and defections from Irish party, 205–6; appeal to Rome seconded by large section of bishops and clergy, 207; no agreement arrived at, 207–8; abolition of "ministers' money" and gradual removal of disabilities of Catholics, 209; state of Established Church and efforts

Ireland, Church in—*continued*
to proselytise Irish people, 210–11; agitation for disestablishment of Irish church, 211; Government alarm at disturbed state of country, 212; Disestablishment proposed in House of Commons; opposition of Protestants in Ireland, 212–3; Disestablishment Act becomes law; its nature and effects, 213–5; Irish Catholics treated less liberally than minority, 215. EDUCATION IN IRELAND.—Efforts of proselytisers to destroy Catholicity in Ireland by means of education, ii. 216–20; disabilities and efforts of Catholics in matter of education, 220; Kildare Street Society founded, 221; condition of Irish schools, 222; opposition of Irish bishops to the school system, 222; establishment of National Schools, 223; opposition of all parties to National Schools, 223; further attempts at proselytism in National Schools, 225; state of National Schools, 226; inadequate compliance with demands of Irish bishops, 227; rise in percentage of unmixed schools, 227; scheme of central Model schools inaugurated, 228–9; condemned by bishops, 228; free training-colleges for Catholic teachers established, 229. SECONDARY EDUCATION:—Overwhelming advantages of Protestant minority in regard to secondary schools, ii. 230–2; disabilities of Catholics in matter of secondary education, 232; satisfactory condition of Catholic schools, 233; Intermediate Education Bill passed, 234; secondary education in Ireland still unsatisfactory, 234. UNIVERSITY EDUCATION:—Catholics practically excluded from university education, ii. 235–6; the Queen's Colleges, 236–7; university education in England and Scotland still denominational, 237; opposed by Irish bishops and people; suggested amendments, 238; Government rejects these amendments substantially, 239; question of Colleges lapses, 239; the Queen's Colleges condemned in Rome, 239–40; condemned at Synod of Thurles, 240; scheme of a Catholic University mooted, 240; time unfavourable for such a scheme, 241; Irish bishops resolve to found a University; preparations to open same, 242; funds inadequate; university hampered for want of a charter, 242–3; difficulties and dissension, 244; no charter, 245–6; Lord Mayo's scheme, 246–7; Gladstone's University Bill introduced into Parliament, 248; bill condemned by all parties, and defeated in Commons, 248–9; religious tests abolished in Trinity College, 250; Royal University unsatisfactory; various steps taken to remedy Catholic grievances; the Irish Universities Act, 251–2. EDUCATION OF THE CLERGY:—Irish clerics trained in various places in Europe, ii. 253; colleges closed, 254–5; Carlow College opened, 255; different views of bishops and English government in regard to education of Irish clergy, 255; petition of bishops to the Lord Lieutenant refused; bishops petition for a college in each province, 256; bill for establishment of college introduced and passed, 257–8; its nature and provisions, 258; college founded at Maynooth, 259; first staff, 259; lay establishment at Maynooth, 259; Government visitation of college and demand for suppression of lay-college, 260; Trustees change their plans, but lay-college suppressed after a time, 260–1; Dunboyne Establishment, history of, 261; attacks made against Maynooth refuted by the Royal Commission, 262; increase of annual grant at petition of Trustees, 262; another Royal Commission in Maynooth, 262; Maynooth freed from state control and given over to bishops entirely, 263; introduction of university system, 263; rapid

Ireland, Church in—*continued* development of Maynooth College, 263-4; foundation of All Hallows; its purpose and success in supplying priests for foreign missions, ii. 264; history of Irish Colleges in Rome, France, Spain, and the Netherlands, ii. 265. Various theological institutions in Ireland, ii. 266
Ireland, ecclesiastical music in, ii. 489
Irish agrarian movement, ii. 518, 520
Irish apologists, ii. 481
Irish bishops at Vatican Council, i. 452, 461
Irish bishops and priests at first synod in Australia, ii. 388
Irish Catholics in England, ii. 1, 3; in Scotland, ii. 90 1; in United States, ii. 99, 285, 288
Irish Christian Brothers, ii. 443; volunteers for Australia, ii. 386; in Melbourne, ii. 391
Irish clergy and nuns in Mauritius Island, ii. 424
Irish colony in Argentine Republic, ii. 375
Irish convicts in Australia, ii. 379 *sqq.*
Irish Dominicans in the West Indies, ii. 428
Irish emigrants in Canada, ii. 339-42; in England, ii. 1, 49; in Newfoundland, ii. 348 9; in Queensland, ii. 393; in Scotland, ii. 69, 91; in South Africa, ii. 420 1
Irish in Gibraltar, ii. 425; in Goulbourn, ii. 394; in New Zealand, ii. 400
Irish Nationalist Party, ii. 69, 76
Irish priests in Australia, ii. 379; in Jamaica and British Guiana, ii. 428; in Melbourne, ii. 390 91; in South Australia, ii. 392
Irish priests and nuns volunteer for Australian mission, ii. 385-6; in Melbourne, 390-1; in Western Australia, ii. 389; in Newfoundland, ii. 349; in New Zealand, ii. 400; in South Africa, ii. 420-1
rish Sisters of Charity, ii. 443
Irish Sisters of Mercy, ii. 443
Irish Society, ii. 219, 222
Isabella, Infanta, i. 166
Isabella II. of Spain, i. 166-8, 381
Issoudoun, ii. 416
Italy: Papacy and, i. 197; United Italy movement, i. 212; "Young Italy Party" schemes for Union, i. 228-30, 418; Pius IX. and Italy, i. 418 *et seq.* *See* Papal States; revolutions in Italian States, i. 421; anti-Austrian revolt, i. 421-2; Napoleon III. and Italian unity, i. 426; revolutions and union of various states with Piedmont, i. 426; further annexations, Victor Emmanuel King of Italy, i. 429; "*September Convention*," i. 430; attack on Papal States, i. 431; siege and capture of Rome, i. 432; "*Law of Guarantees*," i. 433; Church and State, i. 434; Italian occupation of Rome, i. 435; Italian bishoprics, i. 436; confiscation of ecclesiastical property, i. 436, 474; Italy and Papacy under Leo XIII., i. 471 *et seq.*; penal code of Zanardelli, i. 473; hostility of Italian political ministers, i. 472-4; penal legislation; confiscation, i. 472-474

J

Jackson, Rev. Mr., ii. 128
Jacobini, Cardinal, i. 472; ii. 519
Jacobs, i. 367
Jacobins, i. 19, 20, 23
Jaffé, ii. 477
Jäger, Professor, ii. 515
Jahn, ii. 471, 480
Jahrbuch für Philosophie und Speculative Theologie, ii. 469
"Jalès, federation of," i. 17
Jamaica, ii. 426
James I., ii. 231
Jannet, M. Claudio, ii. 517
Jansenism, ii. 485
Jansenists, i. 6, 16, 378, 464
Janssen, ii. 478
Janus, i. 445
Japan, missions in, ii. 434-5. *See* Missions
Japanese martyrs canonised, i. 435
Jarente, i. 17
Jaurès, i. 246
Jausions, Dom, ii. 489
Jemappes, i. 22, 140
Jena, i. 42

Jerusalem, Patriarch of, ii. 429, 430
Jesuits :—suppressed in France, i. 57–8 ; in Switzerland, i. 132, 134, 137, 346 ; Netherlands, i. 155 ; Spain, i. 164, 167 ; Portugal, i. 173, 179 ; persecuted in France, i. 227 ; suppressed, i. 228 ; Jesuits and Italian Unity, i. 231 ; in France, i. 235, 260, 270 ; Bavaria, i. 287 ; Bismarck and Jesuits, i. 302-3, 312 ; law of banishment, i. 313 ; expelled from Hesse, i. 316 ; Holland, i. 317 ; Denmark, i. 411 ; Papal States, i. 422 ; work of, in India, ii. 417 ; in South Africa, ii. 422 ; in Jamaica, Honduras and British Guiana, ii. 428 ; Jesuit College at Beirut, ii. 430, 474 ; in China, ii. 432–3 ; suppression of Jesuits, ii. 436 ; Jesuits resist *Aufklärung* movement, ii. 449 ; Jesuit scholars opponents of Ontologism, ii. 455 ; Jesuit theologians, ii. 485 ; banishment out of several countries and the dissolution of, ii. 440 ; vicissitudes until the re-establishment of the society ; persecutions in Russia and France, ii. 440 ; in Spain, Portugal and Italy, in Switzerland and Austria, ii. 441 ; work done in education, ii. 442 ; reviews edited by, ii. 442 ; in American Indian Missions, ii. 297 ; expelled from Peru, ii. 370
Jogues, Father, ii. 268
John, Dom, i. 174 *et seq.*
John, Patriarch of Constantinople, ii. 40
John, IV., King of Portugal, ii. 377
Jolly, Ministry of, i. 313-4
Joseph II., i. 75 ; centralisation policy in Church and State, i. 75 ; anti-religious legislation, i. 76–8 ; Joseph II. and Pius VI. i. 78 ; favours Febronianism, i. 79 ; discord in Hungary and Netherlands, i. 80-1 ; centralisation schemes in Netherlands, i. 39 ; supports partition of Poland, i. 185
Josephine and Napoleon, i. 43 ; divorced, i. 45
Josephism, i. 76, 88, 98, 105, 108, 112, 330 ; ii. 449–51, 481
Jourdan, General, i. 25
Jowett, Professor, ii. 78
Juárez, President, ii. 352-3
Jubilee year of Leo XII., i. 216
Julius II., Pope, ii. 73
July, Monarchy of, i. 59
Jungmann, ii. 475 6
Junot, General, i. 175
Junta, Roman, ii. 284
Juntas of the Faith, i. 165
Jurors and non-Jurors, i. 18
Jury Packing in Ireland, ii. 209
Jus Institutionis, ii. 282, 296
Jus Patronatus, ii. 282, 296, 369

K

Kane, Sir Robert, ii. 239
Kansas City, ii. 291
Kant, ii. 449, 456, 466
Kanzler, General, i. 431–2
Katholiek, i. 156
Kaunitz, i. 78, 80, 185
Kautsky, ii. 506
Keble, John, ii. 25, 28, 30, 32, 38, 42, 54, 77, 81
Keenan, Sir Patrick, ii. 426
Keller, bishop, i. 118
Kelly, F., ii. 323
Kempff, von, i. 115
Kenmare, Lord, ii. 107, 112, 114, 115, 117, 129, 140, 141
Kenrick, Archbishop of St. Louis, i. 450, 452, 458, 461 ; ii. 281
Kenrick, Bishop of Philadelphia and Archbishop of Baltimore, ii. 281, 283-4, 288, 297, 483
Kensington, House of higher studies at, ii. 67
Keogh, John, ii. 115-7, 122-3
Keogh, William, ii. 202-5
Keon, Myles, ii. 141
Kerry, ii. 63
Ketteler (William Emmanuel von) Bishop of Mayence, i. 290, 297 *et seq.*, 315, 459 ; history of, birth and education, ii. 513 ; takes energetic part in Labour question, ii. 514 ; co-operating with leading men, ii. 515 ; founder of Catholic Labour Association, ii. 521
Kilcullen, ii. 380
Kildare, Co., ii. 141 ; Kildare and Leighlin, ii. 94, 220 ; Kildare Street Society, ii. 221
Kilfenora, ii. 178
Kilkenny, ii. 141 ; Corporation of, ii. 189, 209 ; College at, ii. 266, 385

Killala, ii. 136, 190
Killeen, Lord, ii. 185
Kilmacduagh, ii. 177, 178
Kilmurry, ii. 181
Kilwarden, Lord, ii. 260
Kimberley, Vicariate of, ii. 390, 393
Kingsley, Rev. Charles, ii. 60
Kingston, ii. 340, 343
Kinsale, ii. 209
Kirwan, Father, ii. 239
Klee, i. 110; ii. 483, 484
Klein, M. L'Abbé, ii. 333
Kleutgen, i. 453, 459; ii. 455, 458, 467, 484
Knabenbaur, ii. 474
Knights of Labour, ii. 509
Knocktopher, ii. 180
Knoll, ii. 483
Knoodt, i. 461; ii. 458
Knox, Mr., ii. 260
Koch, i. 106
Kolping, ii. 521
Kopp, i. 311
Körber, i. 335
Kössing, ii. 487
Kosciusko, i. 186, 399
Kossuth, i. 88, 327, 336
Kraus, ii. 475, 477
Krogh-Tonning, Dr., i. 416
Kübel, Bishop, i. 295, 313, 315
Küchler, i. 225
Kuenen, ii. 470
Kuenzer, i. 123
Kuhn, ii. 480
Kulturkampf in Prussia, i. 300, 306, 308; campaign begins, i. 301; "May Laws," i. 304; civil control of ecclesiastical education and clergy, i. 305; Catholic resistance, i. 306; English sympathy with persecution, i. 306; bishops and priests imprisoned and "civil marriage" law, i. 308; Pius IX. and German Catholics, i. 309; expulsion of religious orders, i. 309; peace proposals and end of Kulturkampf in Prussia, i. 312; in Baden, i. 313-315; in Hesse, 315 6; in Bavaria, i. 316-8; ii. 494
Kyle, ii. 94, 95

L

Labour. *See* "Catholic Labour Movement," ii. 511-524; Socialism, ii. 498-510
Labourers in France before Revolution, i. 5
Labour Representative Committee, ii. 510
Lachat, Bishop, i. 346, 351
Lacordaire, i. 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 68, 223, 234, 240; ii. 439, 448, 481, 512
Lacroix, Mgr., i. 271
Ladies' Hibernian Society, ii. 222
Lafayette, i. 13
Lagrange, O.P., ii. 439, 474, 480
Lalor, Miss Alice, ii. 274, 311
Lambert, Bishop, ii. 349
Lambeth Conference, ii. 86
Lambruschini, Cardinal, i. 194, 228, 230, 419; ii. 297
"*Lamentabili*" decree, ii. 463, 464
Lamennais, Felicité de, i. 60, 62, 63, 151, 223, 234, 440; ii. 36, 448, 452, 479, 491, 512
Lamennais, Jean de, ii. 443
Lamorcière, General, i. 427, 428
Lamy, Etienne, i. 264, 267
Landriot, i. 242, 259
Landsdowne, Lord, ii. 197
Landtag, i. 101, 282
Langen, i. 461, 464; ii. 473
Langrishe, Hercules, ii. 119, 125
Languedoc, i. 2
Lanigan, Dr., ii. 157, 394
La Propriété c'est le Vol, ii. 503
Lapparent, ii. 480
Lassalle, Ferdinand, ii. 503, 506, 513
Lasso, Orlando di, ii. 488
Latouche, David, ii. 120, 125
Laurier, Sir W., ii. 344
Laval, Bishop, ii. 348
Laval, University of, ii. 347, 348
Lavigerie, Cardinal, i. 265, 480; ii. 442
Lazarist Fathers, ii. 360, 416; in China, 433, 492
Leahy, Dr., i. 452; ii. 241
Leblanc, i. 242
Le Blant, ii. 477
Ledochowski, Cardinal, i. 307 *et seq.*
Ledru-Rollin, i. 234, 236
Legislature, ii. 313
Le Hir, ii. 472
Lehmkuhl, ii. 486
Leinster, Duke of, ii. 109, 124, 126, 221, 258.
Leipzig, battle of, i. 49; Council of German Catholics at, ii. 459
Lejay, ii. 476

Lemberg, University of, ii. 494
Lenning, Canon, i. 279, 297
Le Noir, ii. 473
Lenormant, ii. 473
Leo XII., early life and election, i. 214; ecclesiastical and civil policy, i. 215, i. 94, 116; and Holland, i. 155; and Bavarian bishops, i. 317; friendly attitude towards Mexican Republic, ii. 351; his death, i. 217
Leo XIII.:—Pontificate of, i. 465-485; early life and election, i. 470; relation of Papacy with European States, i. 470; with Italy, i. 471, 473; policy of conciliation, i. 471, 486; protests against succession of Emmanuel III., i. 475; Leo XIII. and Germany, i. 475-6; Leo and Switzerland, i. 476; convention with Russia, i. 477; and Portugal, i. 477; Leo XIII. and Third Republic in France, i. 261, 263, 265, 267; protests against Associations Bill, i. 270; i. 477, 478, 486; Pope and Kulturkampf, i. 310-311; Pope and Austrian bishops, i 334; Switzerland, i. 350, 351, 365; Leo. XIII. and Portugal, i. 396; and Poland, i. 402, 404; convention with Alexander III. of Russia, i. 402; Encyclical to the Slavs, i. 408; Encyclicals of, i. 470-480; on the Slave Trade, i. 480-1; Russia and the Slavs, i. 481; the Oriental Christians, i. 481–2; foreign missions, i. 482; Anglican Church, i, 482; Neo-Scholasticism, i. 483; Vatican archives open for historical research, i. 484; on the study of Scripture, i. 485; on the Rosary and other devotions, i. 486; ii. 430, 431, 432, 438; allows English Catholics to attend national universities with certain restrictions, ii. 67; Encyclical, *Ad Anglos*, ii. 72; appoints commission to inquire into validity of Anglican Orders; issues condemnation of same, in Encyclical, *Apostolicae Curae*, ii. 73; by brief, *Ex supremo Apostolatus apice* establishes hierarchy in Scotland, ii. 95; arranges dispute in reference to Catholic Education in America,
Leo XIII.—*continued*
ii. 318; settles controversy about *Americanism*, ii. 334; sends Papal Delegate to Canada, ii. 345, concordat with Portugal, ii. 420; confirms privileges of Jesuits, ii. 441; encourages revival of Scholasticism, ii. 467, 475, 480, 518, 519
Leogesselschaft, i. 341, 485
Leopold II. and Church in Tuscany, i. 81; Emperor of Austria and Netherlands, i. 82, 140; and Church in Austria, i. 83
Leopold II., of Belgium, i. 481
Leopold, King of the Belgians, i. 150, 367
Leopold, Prince of Bavaria, i. 317
Leopold, Grand-Duke of Baden, i. 289
Leopold, Prince of Hohenzollern, i. 383
Le Page, ii. 56
Lequeux, ii. 449
Lerolle, M., i. 269
Leroux, i. 236; ii. 502
Le Roy, Mgr., ii. 481
Lessing, ii. 470, 471
Lessons of Christianity, ii. 224, 225
Leu, Joseph, i. 132, 134
Lewis, Father, ii. 271, 272
Liberal Catholics, i. 60 64, 148, 240 *sqq.*; i. 287; i. 300; i. 419; i. 438 *sqq.*; ii. 4, 38, 59, 64, 460-3; in France, i. 240 *sqq.*, 244, 259; ii. 334 *sqq.*; union of Liberal and Conservative Catholics in France, i. 248, 429; Liberal Catholic Professors of Munich, i. 286-7, 302; Liberal Catholics in Germany and France, i. 443 *sqq.*; in England, i. 447 8; in Switzerland, i. 456; Liberal and Conservative Catholics, ii. 461-3
Liberalism in Austria, i. 75-80, 330 *sqq.*, 341; in Bavaria, i. 101–110, 289, 317; in Belgium, i. 148 *sqq.*; i. 356 *sqq.*; in Germany, i. 300 *sqq.*; in Hesse, i. 297; in Holland, i. 157, 374 *sqq.*; in Spain, i. 163; in Switzerland, i. 127, 130, 456; in Upper Rhine Provinces, i. 111–124; condemned in Syllabus, i. 440
Liberalism, political, its connexion with Socialism, ii. 500-1

Liberal Labour Party, ii. 510
Liberal Radical Party, ii. 368, 369
Liberatore, S.J., ii. 455, 467
Liberia, ii. 323
Liber Pontificalis, ii. 477
Liberum Veto, i. 186
Liebensfrauen, ii. 514
Liebermann, ii. 442
Liège, ii. 272, 517
Ligue d'enseignement, i. 246, 259
Lille, ii. 254, 492
Limerick, ii. 106, 141, 209; Union, ii. 188; Corporation, ii. 189
Lipp, Bishop, i. 295
Lisbon, ii. 253, 254, 519
Lismore, ii. 89, 92
Litta, Cardinal, i. 188; ii. 22, 158, 159, 160
Littlemore, ii. 45, 47, 48
Little Sisters of the Poor, ii. 443
Littrè, i. 245; ii. 472
Llevaneras, ii. 73
Llorente, Antonio, i. 162
Lloyd, Dr., ii. 27
Local Government Board (Ireland), ii. 188
Locke, i. 7
Loftus, ii. 120
Loir-et-Cher, i. 18
Lombard College in Paris, ii. 254
London Hibernian Society, ii. 219, 221
London Missionary Society, ii. 222
Londonderry Academical Institute, ii. 231
Longford, ii. 141
Lorenzana, Cardinal, i. 162
Lorenzelli, ii. 468
Loretto Sisters, ii. 311, 443
Los Andes, ii. 366
Lösewitz, Count, ii. 515
Loubet, President, i. 267-8, 273
Louis, St., ii. 289
Louis XIV., absolutism of, i. 1, 6, and National Debt, i. 9
Louis XV., character of reign, i. 2, 6, 9
Louis XVI., i. 5; his character, i. 9; convokes Estates General, i. 10, and National Assembly, i. 11; Louis XVI. and civil constitution of the clergy, i. 16, 17; and Legislative Assembly, i. 19, 20; executed, i. 22
Louis XVIII., i. 36, 38; flees to Ghent, i. 54; returns to France, i. 52; constitution of, i. 53; returns to Paris, i. 56; Louis and the Church, i. 56, 213; and Spain, i. 165-7
Louis, Philippe, King, i. 59, 66, 67 abdicated, i. 67; church in reign of, i. 68; relations with Italy, i. 220; replaced by republic, i. 233; ii. 449
Louis I. of Bavaria, i. 97, 110, 111 285
Louis II. of Bavaria, i. 286
Louis, St., Sisters of, ii. 443
Louisiana, ii. 322
Louth, Co., ii. 141
Louvain, American College at, ii. 497
Louvain University, i. xii.; suppression of, i. 141; foundation of Catholic University of, i. 372; its rapid development and legal position, i. 372-3; Leo XIII. and, i. 483; Neo-Scholasticism in and foundation of Philosophical Institute at, i. 483; Traditionalism in, ii. 454; Mgr. Mercier and the Philosophical Institute, ii. 469; *Cours de Philosophie* of, ii. 469; school of historical studies at, ii. 478; education of ecclesiastical students in, ii. 495
Lovat, Rev. Charles, ii. 385
Löwe, i. 461
Lowell, ii. 288 310
Loyson, Père Hyacinth, i. 349
Luca, Cardinal, i. 484
Lucas, Frederick, ii. 193, 197, 201, 203, 207-208
Lucerne, ii. 331
Lueger, Dr., i. 333; ii. 522
Lüft, ii. 487
Lulworth, Castle, ii. 20, 272
Luna, ii. 370
Luneville, Peace of, i. 28, 71, 84
Lutz, von, i. 302, 316 *et seq.*
Luxemburg, Grand Duchy of; political changes, i. 379; Church in, i. 380
Luzerne, la, Cardinal, ii. 446
Lynch, Bishop, ii. 94
Lynch, Dominick, ii. 273
Lynch, Mr., ii. 141
Lyons, i. 24; Seminary of African missions at, ii 459
Lyra Ecclesiastica, ii. 489

M

Maanen, Van, i. 155
Maassen, i. 465
Mabillon, ii. 437
MacCarthy, Professor, ii. 245
MacDonald, ii. 116
MacDonnell, Alexander, Bishop, ii. 340
MacDonnell, Bishop, ii. 427
MacEachern, Angus, ii. 340
Macejowice, battle of, i. 187
MacHale, Dr., ii. 175; Letters of Hierophilos, ii. 175; supports Repeal; elected archbishop of Tuam, ii. 190, 191; appeal to Propaganda, ii. 193, 194; refutes charges of English Government, ii. 196; goes to Rome, ii. 198, 200; supports Catholic Defence Association, ii. 203; expresses his views on pledge-breaking, ii. 204; in Rome, ii. 207; loyalty to memory of Lucas, ii. 208; attacks Kildare Street Schools under name of Hierophilos, ii. 221; opposes National Schools, ii. 223; opposes the Queen's Colleges, ii. 238, 239, 241, 315, 481; at Vatican Council, i. 458
Mack, Dr., i. 119
Mack, General, i. 84
MacKnight, Dr., ii. 201, 204
MacKonchie, Rev. A. H., ii. 84
MacMahon, Marshal, i. 251; president of Republic, i. 252, 255, 258
MacMahon, Patrick, M.P., ii. 207
MacManus, T. B., ii. 212
MacPherson, Rev. P., ii. 157
Macquarie, General, ii. 404
Madagascar, ii. 381
Madras, ii. 419
Madrid, ii. 253, 89
Madura, ii. 419
Magdalen Islands, ii. 340
Magee, Dr., ii. 174
Magenta, i. 248, 426
Maguire, John Francis, ii. 207, 212
Maher, ii. 469
Mai, Cardinal, ii. 35, 476
Maignen, M., ii. 334
Maine, State of, ii. 289, 322, 268
Maistre, Joseph de, i. 57; ii. 447, 451, 453, 479, 481
Maitland, diocese of, ii. 394; bishop of, ii. 397
Malay States, ii. 434
Malebranche, ii. 455
Mallinckrodt, i. 301, 310
Malouet, i. 14
Malou, i. 360, 361, 362, 367
Mamiani, Count, i. 422
Mancini, i. 437
Mangalore, diocese of, ii. 420
Manifesto and Appeal, The, ii. 8, 10
Manitoba, ii. 344, 345, 346, 347
Manning, Cardinal; Vatican Council and Infallibility, i. 447, 450, 451, 457, 458, 462, 479; ii. 39, 48 birth and career at Oxford; rector of Lavington; at first of Evangelical tendencies; sympathises with the Tractarian party; tries to justify helplessness of Anglican church *re* Hereford bishopric, ii. 52, 53; supports bishop of Exeter, ii. 55; during agitation against Papal Brief converted, ii. 55; ordained and goes to Rome, ii. 55; founds "Oblates of St. Charles," and is appointed provost of Westminster; refuses to submit rules of Oblates to chapter; conducts case ably at Rome; supports *Dublin Review*, ii. 60; distrusts Newman, ii. 62; appointed archbishop of Westminster, ii. 63; displays great energy in church government, ii. 63; opposes erection of Catholic Hall at Oxford; supports definition of dogma of Papal Infallibility, ii. 64; has frequent interviews with English agent at Rome, ii. 64; returns to England and explains true nature of Infallibility, ii. 65; replies to Gladstone's pamphlet, ii. 65; advocates cause of temperance; endeavours to provide higher education for Catholic youth, but fails, ii. 67; delivers lectures on "Rights and Dignity of Labour," ii. 68; success as an arbitrator at time of London strike, ii. 69; death, ii. 70; visitation of Scotland and report to Rome, ii. 328; 460, 481, 518
Mansi, ii. 477
Maori tribes, ii. 400
Marat, i. 21, 22, 24
Marc Clement, ii. 486

Marcian, Emperor, ii. 430
Mardin, Prefecture Apostolic of, ii. 430
Maréchal, Abbé, ii. 277
Marengo, battle of, i. 28, 84, 199
Maret, Mgr., ii. 512
Maria II. of Spain, i. 390
Maria da Gloria (Donna), i. 178, 180
Maria Francisca (Portugal), i. 174
Maria Louisa, i. 43, 49
Maria Louisa, Queen of Etruria, i. 52, 207
Maria Louisa of Parma, i. 160
Maria Monk, ii. 288
Maria Theresa, i. 75
Maria Cristina, of Spain and Naples, i. 165, 166, 168, 387
Marie Antoinette, i. 20
Marilley, Bishop, i. 138, 344, 348
Marion de Brésilac, Mgr., ii. 442
Marists, ii. 319, 400, 401, 416, 422, 469, 492
Marist Brothers, ii. 347, 391, 422, 423, 424, 443
Marlborough Street (Training College), ii. 228 30
Marquette, Fr., ii. 268
Martène, ii. 437
Martin, Bishop, i. 242, 450, 451
Martiniana, Cardinal, i. 30
Martinucci, i. 472; ii. 487
Marucchi, ii. 476
Maryland, State of, ii. 268, 270, 273, 277
Marx, Karl, i. 246, 388; ii. 329, 503, 505, 506, 508, 509
Maskell, ii. 55
Masonic. *See* Freemason
Massachussets, State of, ii. 270
Massena, General, i. 28
Massimo, Santos, ii. 374
Mastai-Ferretti, Cardinal and Pope. *See* Pius IX.
Mattei, Cardinal, i. 198, 202, 207
Mathieu, Mgr. i. 441, 450, 458
Mauritius Islands, ii. 424, 425
Maury, Abbé, i. 14, 30, 32, 46; ii. 446
Maximilian, Archduke and Emperor of Mexico, ii. 352 *sqq.*
Maximilian I., of Bavaria, i. 285
Maximilian IV., i. 102
Maximilian, Kaspar (Bishop of Münster), i. 47
Maxwell ii. 120
May, Laws, i. 304; relaxed, i. 319
Mayence, ii. 493, 513, 515
Mayer, ii. 471
Maynooth College, its foundation, ii. 253-59; lay college at and suppressed by government, 259 61; Dunboyne Establishment, 261; separated from State, 263; present organisation, 263 4; trustees of Maynooth, 145-61; students volunteer for Australia, ii. 385-6; chair of ecclesiastical music in, ii. 489; Maynooth and Papal Infallibility, i. 448
Mayo, Lord, ii. 246, 247
Mazarin, Cardinal i. 1
Mazenod, Père, ii. 442
Mazzella, Cardinal, i. 310; ii. 73
Mazzini, i. 228, 230, 418, 420, 423
McCarthy, Dean, ii. 17
McCloskey, Archbishop, i. 452
McCormick, Richard, ii. 115, 116, 117
McEncroe, Father, ii. 383, 384, 385
McKenna, Theobald, ii. 141
Méan, de (Bishop), i. 145
Meath, ii. 141, 142
Mechlin, Catholic Congress at, ii. 60, 461; Seminary of, ii. 495
Mediation, Government of, i. 126
Melbourne, See of, ii. 390, 391, 392, 396, 397; University at, ii. 411
Melbourne, Lord, ii. 182, 191
Melchers, Archbishop, i. 307
Melodies, Les Grégoriennes, ii. 489
Mendizabal, i. 167
Menelik, Emperor, i. 474
Mentana, battle of, i. 431
Menzies, John, ii. 92
Mercier, Cardinal, i. 483; ii. 468, 469
Mermillod, Bishop, i. 348, 351, 353, 476
Merry Del Val, ii. 345, 73
Messenger of the Sacred Heart, ii. 442
Metaphysical Society, ii. 67
Metternich, i. 53, 55, 87, 88, 209, 213, 222
Metz, i. 250; ii. 493
Mexico:—Vicissitudes in Mexican Government, ii. 350; causes of misfortunes of Catholic religion in Mexico, ii. 351; war of Mexico with foreign powers, ii. 352; Emperor Maximilian, ii. 352, 353; separation of Church and State

Mexico—*continued*
in Mexico, ii. 353; results of separation, ii. 354; present condition of Mexican Church, ii. 355
Meyer, Father S.J., ii. 469
Meyer, Rudolph, ii. 516
Meyer (Swiss Catholic leader), i. 134, 136
Michaud, Abbé, i. 461
Michelet, i. 227, 66
Michelis, Prof., i. 461, 462, 465
Migazzi, Cardinal, i. 78
Migne, Abbé, i. 66; ii. 476
Miguel, Dom (Pretender), i. 166, 177, 179
Milan, ii. 416
Mill Hill Seminary, ii. 76; ii. 416
Milner, Dr., ii. 7, 8, 10, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 34, 35, 151, 152, 153, 156
Minardi (Painter), i. 225
Minerva University, ii. 439
Minto, Lord, ii. 197
Miollis, General, i. 41, 200
Mirabeau, i. 14, 17
Miramon, ii. 352
Mirari Vos, i. 63, 323
Miroudot, i. 17, 18
Missionaries of Mill Hill, London, ii. 443
Missionary, The, ii. 294
Missions, Catholic: causes of decline in the nineteenth century, ii. 413, &c.; missionary activity in the nineteenth century, ii. 414; establishment of seminaries for foreign missions, ii. 415; obstacles to missionary work, ii. 417. IN BRITISH COLONIES.—India: good work done by missionaries at first, causes obstructing their further efforts, ii. 418; disastrous effects of right of patronage, ii. 418; Portuguese Government refuse to accede to the Pope's wishes, strong action of the Pope, ii. 419; Goa schism, ii. 419, 420; present condition of Catholics in India, ii. 421; state of education, ii. 421; South Africa: missions in Cape Colony, Natal, Transvaal, ii. 421–24; Mauritius Islands, ii. 424–25; Gibraltar, ii. 425; Malta. ii. 426; the West Indies, ii. 426–7. WESTERN ASIA.—Different rites, Latin, Greek, Armenian, Maronite, Syrian, Chaldean, Coptic,
Missions, Catholic—*continued*
Abyssinian, account for Church organisation, ii. 429–32. EASTERN ASIA.—China, ii. 432–34; Corea, ii. 434; Japan, ii. 434–5; Africa, ii. 435
Missions, Foreign, and Leo XIII., i. 482
Mitchell, John, ii. 199, 205
Mixed Marriages, i. 86, 90, 93, 95, 96, 99, 103, 110, 118, 119, 127, 140, 195–218, 331, 345
Mocquereau, ii. 438
Möhler, i. 110; ii. 477, 482, 483
Molloy, Mgr., ii. 480
Monaghan, ii. 141, 169
Monaghan, Dr., ii. 427
Monarchy of July, i. 59
Moncrieff, Sir James, ii. 92
Monroe, President, ii. 322
Monsabré, O.P., ii. 439, 481
Monsell, Lord Emly, ii. 55
Montalembert, ii. 448, 460, 461, 512, 517; i. 60, 62, 63, 65, 223, 234, 237, 238, 240, 313, 440, 447, 454
Montauban, i. 17
Montenegro, Church in, i. 406
Montesquieu, i. 173
Montez, Lola, i. 110
Montevideo, Treaty of, ii. 374
Montgelas, i. 102, 107
Month, The, ii. 442
Montreal, ii. 327, 341, 343, 347, 348; seminary at, ii. 319
Montserrat, ii. 427
Monuments of German Musical Art, ii. 488
Monuments of Austrian Musical Art, ii. 488
Moore, George Henry, ii. 204, 207
Moran, Cardinal, archbishop of Sydney; rector of Irish College; writer on Irish history; transferred from Ossory to Sydney; created Cardinal, 1885; presides at Australian synods, ii. 398, 402; his history of Australian Church, ii. 378
Moreau, General, i. 26, 28
Moreno, Garcia, President of Ecuador, ii. 366; reforms of, ii. 367; friendly attitude towards the Church, ii. 368; death of, ii. 368
Moreton Bay Settlement, ii. 393
Moriarty, Bishop, i. 452
Morin, Dom, O.S.B., ii. 438
Moroni, Gaetano, i. 225
Morpeth, Lord, ii. 182

Morris, Dr., ii. 384
Moscow, i. 48
Mosher, ii. 321
Mosul, ii. 430
Moufang, Canon, ii. 515
Moylan, Dr., ii. 17, 123, 146, 147
Mozart, ii. 487
Müller, i. 468
Mullinahone, ii. 181
Multa præclare, Encyclical, ii. 419
Mun, Comte de, and Catholic party, i. 263, 269, 479; ii. 517
Munich, ii. 493; University, ii. 513; Catholic Congress at, ii. 60, 461; Munich and Catholic learning, i. 110
Münster, ii. 493
Murat, King of Naples, i. 55, 56; ii. 158
Murdoch, Dr., ii. 93, 94
Murphy, Dr., ii. 160
Murphy, Rev. Francis, ii. 386, 388, 392, 399
Murray, Archbishop of Dublin, ii. 158, 159, 160, 161, 165, 185, 191, 193, 195, 223, 240
Murray, Bishop of Maitland, ii. 394
Murray, Dr., of Maynooth, i. 448; ii. 481, 483
Mutiny Bill, ii. 109
Muzzi, Cardinal, i. 419

N

Nagasaki, ii. 435
Nanking, Treaty of, ii. 432
Nantes, ii. 254
Naper, Mr., ii. 185
Napoleon Bonaparte, i. 25; seizes Papal States, First Consul, i. 27; Marengo, i. 28, 199; internal organisation of France, i. 28; religious views, i. 29; negotiations, i. 30, 31; concordat ratified, i. 32; Napoleon and Constitutional bishops, i. 33; proclamation of concordat, i. 34; Napoleon and Organic Articles, i. 35; religious despotism, i. 37; Napoleon and England, i. 37; Emperor, i. 38; coronation, i. 39; disputes with Pius VII., i. 40; seizes papal possessions, i. 41, 200; decree of Schönbrunn, i. 41, 201; annexes Papal States; excommunicated, i. 42, 201; Austerlitz,
Napoleon Bonaparte—*continued*
i. 42; Jena and Auerstädt, i, 42; war with Russia and England, i. 43; war with Spain and Portugal, i. 43; marries Josephine, i. 44; divorce, i. 45; persecution of Pius VII. at Savona, i. 45 46, 202; commission of ecclesiastics, i. 46; national council of French bishops, i. 47, 204; Russian campaign, i. 48, 49, 207; Leipzig, i. 49; Paris taken and Napoleon sent to Elba, i. 50, 207; Pius VII. at Fontainebleau, i 50; Pope and Emperor, i. 50, 51, 52, 205, 206; *Concordat of Fontainebleau*, i. 51, 52, 205; liberates Pius VII.; escapes from Elba, i. 52; Waterloo; St. Helena, and death, i. 54; Pius VII. and Napoleon, i. 54, 55, 205; Tyrol, i. 105; Grand Duke of Baden, i. 113; Switzerland, i. 126; Belgian Church, i. 141; Napoleon and Spain, i. 161; Napoleon and Portugal, i. 175, &c.; Napoleon and Poland, i. 190; Napoleon and Consalvi, i. 199
Napoleon III., ii. 352; President of Second Republic, i. 237; Emperor, i. 237; Napoleon III., i. 240; Napoleon and the Church, i. 237, 247, 249; Napoleon and Papal States, i. 247, 420, &c.; Cavour and the Union of Italy, i. 425, 426; Napoleon and the Syllabus, i. 441; Napoleon and the Jesuits, ii. 440
Narvaez, i. 383
Nassali, Mgr., i. 155
Nassau, i. 298
Natal, ii. 422
National Education, Commissioners of, ii. 225 *sqq.*; ii. 489
Nau, ii. 476
Navan, ii. 422
Navigator's Islands, ii. 401
Nazareth Sisters, ii. 311
Neale, Fr., ii. 275; archbishop of Baltimore, ii. 276, 311
Necker, Comptroller-General, . 9, 10, 11; dismissed, i. 12
Neilson, ii. 116, 133
Nenagh, ii. 217
Neo-Scholastic Philosophy, i. 483 ii. 466-69; ii. 484. *See* Louvain Studies

Nerinckz, Fr., ii. 314
Netherlands, ii. 135; and Joseph II., i. 80; and Austria, i. 83, 139; under France, i. 141; union under William I.; revolt against Spain and Independence, i. 153. *See* Belgium, Holland
Neue Zeit, ii. 506
New Brunswick, ii. 336, 340, 343, 344
New Caledonia, Vicariate Apostolic of, ii. 401
New England, ii. 268
Newfoundland, ii. 343; Church in:—Violent persecution of Catholics by English Government, ii. 348; cessation of persecution, ii. 349; appointment of a bishop and growth of the Church, ii. 349; present condition of Catholic population as compared with other religious persuasions, ii. 349
New Granada, Republic of, ii. 363
New Hampshire, ii. 270, 289
New Holland, ii. 378, 382
New Jersey, ii. 270
Newman, John Henry, ii. 26; birth, career at Oxford, ii. 27; appointed tutor in Oriel College, ii. 27; vicar of St. Mary's, ii. 28; joins the High Church group, ii. 28; writes *Arians of Fourth Century*, ii. 29; visits Rome, ii. 29; illness and return to England, ii. 30; writes his *Tracts for the Times*, ii. 30; style of these, ii. 31; his distrust of Rome, ii. 33; Peel election, ii. 33; Newman's article entitled *Home Thoughts Abroad*, ii. 34; adopts a favourable attitude towards Catholicity in work entitled *The Prophetical Office of the Church*: tracts condemned by bishops, but Newman's party wins new disciples, ii. 38, 39; Dr. Wiseman's article on the Donatists, ii. 39; endeavours to justify position of Anglican Church, ii. 39; publishes *Tract 90* to reconcile Thirty-nine Articles with Catholic dogma, ii. 41; storm of opposition raised, and Tract condemned by Board of Oxford, ii. 42; Newman and Tractarian party banned
Newman, John Henry—*continued* at Oxford, ii. 42; correspondence with Dr. Russell of Maynooth, ii. 44; retires to Littlemore, ii. 44; resigns pastoral charge and preaches farewell sermon, "*Parting of Friends*," ii. 45; investigates so-called "novelties," of Roman Church, ii. 45; converted, ii. 47; removes to old college at Oscott, ii. 48; determines to become a priest and sets out for Rome; is ordained priest, returns to England and founds Oratory; joined by several converts; delivers lectures on *Anglican Difficulties*, ii. 55; delivers lectures on *Present positon of Catholics in England*; preaches sermon, *The Second Spring*, at Oscott; rector of Catholic University, Dublin, and delivers series of lectures, *The Idea of a University*, ii. 56; resigns position of rector and returns to Oratory, ii. 56; negotiates with the party of the *Rambler*, and becomes editor himself, ii. 60; resigns shortly, ii. 60; attack of Kingsley; publishes his *Apologia* in seven parts, ii. 61; Newman determines to found a college for Catholics at Oxford, but opposed, ii. 62; retires to Edgbaston, and composes *Grammar of Assent*, ii. 63; views on Papal Infallibility, ii. 64; writes *Letter to Duke of Norfolk*; created cardinal, goes to Rome; returns to England, ii. 68; death and funeral, ii. 70, 80, 483; rector of Catholic University of Ireland, ii. 241; lectures in Ireland on University Education, ii. 242; fails to make Catholic University a success, ii. 244; resigns rectorship, ii. 245, 481
New Mexico, ii. 268, 322
New Norcia, ii. 389, 390, 393
New Orleans, ii. 277, 284, 315
Newsham, Dr., ii. 35
Newtownbarry, ii. 180
New York, ii. 270, 275; diocese of, ii. 277, 284, 289, 290, 310, 313, 315, 322; Regents of, ii. 321

New Zealand, Church in; futile attempts of Protestant missionaries to convert native tribes, ii. 400; establishment of vicariate of Western Oceanica, ii. 400; division of New Zealand into two dioceses, ii. 400; disastrous effects of natives' rebellion on missions, ii. 401; erection of an archiepiscopal see in New Zealand, ii. 401; state of education, ii. 410; secondary education, ii. 411; university, ii. 411
Ney, General (condemned to death), i. 56
Nicaragua, Church in; troubled history of, ii. 358; sufferings and persecution of Catholic Church, ii. 358; present position of Catholics, ii. 358-9; education, ii. 359
Nicholas I. of Russia, i. 191, &c.; concordat with Pope, i. 194
Nicholas II. of Russia, i. 404
Nicholls, Mr., ii. 187
Niebuhr, i. 91
Nieuwenhuis (Socialist leader), i. 378
Nisard, M., i. 274
Nobles of France, i. 4; position, influence and character of, i. 4, 5; Nobles and Estates General, i. 10; Nobles and National Assembly, i. 11
Nocedal, i. 386
Noldin, ii. 486
Noot, Van der i. 81
Norbury, Lord, ii. 260
Nordez, Mgr. Le, i. 271
Norfolk Island, ii. 379, 380
North Carolina, ii. 270
Norway, liberty of worship, i. 414; present state of Church in, i. 415
Notables, Assembly of, i. 10
Notre Dame, University of, ii. 320
Nova Scotia, ii. 340, 343
Nys, Prof., ii. 469

O

Oakeley, ii. 41, 44; perpetually suspened from office, ii. 46; canon, ii. 55
Oblates of Mary Immaculate, ii. 347, 348, 416, 423, 424, 427, 442
Oblates of St. Francis of Sales, ii. 442
Observantines, Order of, ii. 439
Observants, Order of, ii. 439
O'Connell, Daniel, i. 313; ii. 38, 40, 92, 165-172, 177, 179, 181, 183, 185, 193, 198, 199, 221, 223, 237, 264
O'Connor, Bishop, ii. 315
O'Connor, Charles, ii. 104
O'Connor, Dr., ii. 391
O'Connor, Owen, ii. 160
Odilon-Barrot, M., i. 67
O'Donnell, Dr., ii. 239
O'Donnell, Dr., ii. 349
O'Donnell, General, i. 382
Œuvre des Cercles Catholiques, ii. 517
Ofalia, i. 168
Ogle, ii. 120, 125
O'Hagan, Lord, ii. 209
O'Higgins, Dr., Bishop of Ardagh, ii. 190, 191, 194, 198, 241, 265
Ohio, ii. 271
O'Keefe, ii. 104
O'Keefe, Father, ii. 205
O'Kelly, Dr., ii. 165
Old Catholics, i. 304, 316, 334, 349, 354; formation of sect in Germany, i. 464, &c.; favoured by different governments, i. 465, &c.; Austria, i. 467; Switzerland, i. 467-8; in England, ii. 65
Ollivier, M., i. 249, 463
O'Loughlin, Mgr., ii. 321
Olmütz, University of, ii. 494
Omaha, ii. 290
O'Mahony, ii. 212
O'Mahony, ii. 395
Omer, St., ii. 163, 272
O'Neill, Dr., ii. 425
O'Neill, Father Peter, ii. 380
Ontario, ii. 343
Opera dei Congressi e dei Comitati Cattolici, ii. 517
O'Quinn, Dr., ii. 394
Orange Society, ii. 132
Orange, House of, i. 143
Orange River Free State, ii. 423
Orbin, archbishop, i. 315
Orders and Congregations, Religious, i. 263; congregation laws in France, i. 268, 269, 270; Prussia, i. 281, 284; under Kulturkampf, i. 309, 312, 314, 324; present position in Germany, i. 324; adverse legislation in Austria, i. 333; in Spain, i. 389; in Portugal, i. 391, 392; reasons

Orders, &c.—*continued*
for partial downfall of religious orders, ii. 436; revival of religious orders, ii. 437; adverse legislation in Austria, ii. 437; sufferings of religious orders in France at time of Revolution, ii. 438, &c.; sufferings of religious orders in Russia, Spain, Switzerland, ii. 440, 441; work done in education, ii. 442; establishment of new congregations, ii. 442; congregations for education in primary schools, ii. 443; foundation of new congregations of nuns, ii. 443; religious orders in nineteenth century, ii. 436-43. *See* different orders and congregations
O'Reilly, Dr., ii. 145, 146
O'Reilly, Myles, ii. 242
Organic Articles; origin and nature of, i. 35-39; concordat of Rhine provinces, i. 115; in Belgium, i. 145; ii. 446, 490
Oriel College, Oxford, ii. 25, 26, 27
Oriental churches and Leo XIII., i. 481-2
Origines Les de l'histoire d'aprés la Bible, ii. 473
Orleans, Duke of, i. 4, 5, 6, 11, 22, 59
Ornsby, ii. 56
Orsini, i. 247
Oscar, i. of Sweden, i. 416
Oscott, ii. 40; college at, ii. 48, 56, 58, 59; synod at, ii. 56, 58
O'Shanassy, Mr. John, ii. 390
Ottowa, ii. 343, 347, 348
Oudinot, General, i. 237
Overbeck, i. 225
Owen, Robert, ii. 502
Oxford, ii. 67, 68, 70; Catholics and, ii. 61, 62, 63, 67
Ozanam, Frederic, i. 64; ii. 512

P

Pacca, Cardinal, Secretary of State, i. 41, 200; prisoner at Savona and Fenestrelle, i. 42, 51, 62, 79; character of, i. 200, 206, 207, 208, 212, 219; ii. 450
Paderborn, ii. 493
Paine's *Rights of Man*, ii. 116
Palæstrina, ii. 488
Palma, ii. 475
Palmer, Professor, ii. 30, 31, 42
Palmerston, Lord, i. 136
Palmerston, See of, ii. 393
Palmieri, ii. 468
Panama, ii. 363; Church in; independence and guarantee of freedom of worship, ii. 360; position of Catholics, ii. 360
Pancemont, Mgr. de, i. 34
Panelli (ex-priest), i. 469
Papacy. *See* Papal States, i. 418
Papacy and Italy, i. 197; Church and State, i. 434; Law of Guarantees, i. 435; Italian bishoprics, i. 436. *See* Pius IX. and Leo XIII. Leo XIII. and Italian occupation of Papal States, i. 471; Italian hostility, i. 472-3
Papal *Regesta*, ii. 477
Papal States, Avignon and Venaissin, i, 19; overrun by French, i. 26; Roman Republic proclaimed, i. 26; annexed by Napoleon, i. 42, &c., 200; restored at Congress of Vienna, i. 55, 209; new constitution, i. 211; Consalvi's reforms opposed, i. 212; Papal States and Italian unity, i. 212; revolt in, i. 220; Austria intervenes; reforms introdoced, i. 221: second revolt and foreign intervention, i. 222; Napoleon III. and Papal States, i. 247, 426 *et seq.*; Third Republic and Papal States, i. 254; reforms of Pius IX., i. 419, &c.; constitution for, i, 421; Jesuits withdraw, i. 422; revolt in Papal States, i. 422; Roman Republic established, i. 423; Italian federation scheme, i. 426; Piedmont annexes Romagna, i. 427; Pius IX., calls for volunteers, i. 427; further annexations of Papal territory; Victor Emmanuel, King of Italy, i. 428; *September Convention*, i. 430; Garibaldian attack, i. 431; Rome taken, i. 432; final annexation, i. 433; Church and State in United Italy, i. 434
PARAGUAY:—Early vicissitudes of, ii. 373; number of Catholics, and condition of Church, ii. 373; attitude of State towards education, ii. 373

Paris, ii. 254, 492; *parlement* of, i. 3; captured by Allies, i. 50; University of, i. 57, 58; Peace of, i. 196; second seige of, i. 251; ii. 89
Paris, Comte de, i. 252
Paris, Seminary for Foreign Missions in, ii. 415
Parisis, Mgr., i. 235, 241, 242; ii. 460
Parlements, i. 3, 9
Parma, Duke of, i. 153
Parnell, Sir Henry, ii. 162
Parnell, Sir John, ii. 101, 119, 124, 125, 138
Pascendi dominici gregis, ii. 463, 464
Paschal II., i. 206
Passaglia, ii. 483
Passau, ii. 493
Passionist Fathers, ii. 393
Pastor, Dr., ii. 477
Patrizzi, Cardinal, i. 458
Paul I., Emperor of Russia, i. 88; ii. 440
Paul, IV., Pope, ii. 73
Paul, V., Pope, ii. 378
Paulus, ii. 471
Pécsi, ii. 469
Pedro, Dom, i. 174; Emperor of Brazil, i. 177; King of Portugal, i. 179
Pedro I., Emperor of Brazil, ii. 376
Pedro II., Emperor of Brazil, ii. 376
Peel, Sir Robert, ii. 28, 168, 170, 171, 182, 191, 236, 237
Peep of Day Boys, ii. 122
Peillaube, ii. 469
Peking, Treaty of, ii. 432
Pelham, Mr., ii. 145, 258
Pelloux, General, i. 475
Pennsylvania, ii. 268, 270, 277, 290
Pennsylvania, Court of Common Pleas, ii. 280
Perceval, Arthur, ii. 30, 31
Périer, M. Casimir, i. 266
Périn, M. Charles, ii. 517
Perraud, Mgr., i. 259, 447
Perrone, i. 224, 483
Persia, ii. 430
Persigny, i. 247
Perth, diocese of, ii. 388, 393
Perth, Bishop of, ii. 397
PERU, CHURCH IN:—Political vicissitudes of, ii. 369; religious
Peru, Church in—*continued*
enactments, ii. 370; ecclesiastical education and goverment, ii. 370; varying attitude of Government towards religious orders, ii. 370
Pesch, ii. 469, 483, 484
Pestalozzi, i. 132
Petavius, ii. 483
Petite, La Église, i. 36
Philadelphia, ii. 277, 280, 284, 288, 297, 312
Philip II. of Spain, i. 159
Philip V., i. 165
Philippines, ii. 293
Philipps, i. 110
Philipps, M. Lisle, ii. 41
Philosophia Lacensis, ii. 469
Philosophisches Jahrbuch, ii. 469
Pichegru, General, i. 25
Picpus Fathers, ii. 442
Pie, Mgr., i. 241, 255, 259, 429, 441, 446; ii. 460
Piedmont, House of. *See* Charles Albert, Victor Emmanuel
Pietermaritzburg, ii. 423
Pietri, i. 247
Pietro, Di, i. 52, 202
Pillnitz, i. 20; Declaration of, i. 83
Pinar del Rio, ii. 361
Pistoia, Synod of, i. 81, 82
Pitra, Cardinal, i. 484; ii. 438, 476
Pitt, William, ii. 5, 6, 12, 15, 118, 122, 128, 129, 130, 137, 138, 145
Pittsburg, ii. 315
Pius VI. and Civil Constitution of the clergy, i. 16, 17; armistice with Napoleon, i. 25, 26; prisoner and death, i. 27, 29, 30; at Vienna, i, 76; Pius VI. and Synod of Pistoia, i. 82; Paul I. and Church in Russia, i. 188–9; affairs in Italy at his death, i. 197
Pius VII., i. 29; election and return to Papal States, i. 30, 198; ratifies concordat, i. 32; Pope and *émigré* bishops, i. 33; Pope and Organic Articles, i. 35, 36, 38; crowns Napoleon in Paris, i. 39, 40; fresh difficulties with Napoleon, i. 40; excommunicates Napoleon, i. 42, 201; prisoner at Savona, i. 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 202; resists Napoleon, i. 45, 46; compromises, i. 46, 48; prisoner at Fontainebleau, i.

Pius VII.—*continued*
50; signs *Concordat of Fontainebleau*, i. 51, 205; recalls concessions; back to Savona and Rome, i. 52, 206, 207; Congress of Vienna, i. 53, 54, 209; at Genoa, i. 55, 209; Pope and Francis II., i. 86; Prussian concordat, i. 91, 96, 99, 102; Bavarian concordat, i. 109; Belgian bishops, i. 142, 145; Pius VII. prisoner at Fontainebleau, ii. 157; kindly reception of Irish ambassadors; flight to Genoa, ii. 158; lays down terms for Catholic Emancipation, ii. 158; letter to Irish bishops, ii 160-161, 440, 495; Italian Unity and concordat, i. 211–213; death, i. 213; character and administration, i. 199; ii. 95, 194, 197, 206, 239; Propaganda reorganised by Pius VII., ii. 415, 490
Pius VIII., i. 68; Pius and mixed marriages, i. 94: secret convention for Rhine provinces, i. 117; election and early life, i. 218; brief pontificate and death, i. 219
Pius IX., concordat for Russia and Poland, i. 195; revolution in Rome, flees to Gaëta, i. 237, 423; Encyclical on use of classics, i. 243; on *L'Univers*, i. 244; Pope and Switzerland, i. 350; Pope and Poland, i. 401; Pope and Italy, i. 418 *et seq.*; elected Pope, i. 419; reforms Papal States, i. 419; appeal to the powers, i. 424; Pius and Victor Emmanuel, i. 425; surrender of Rome, i. 432; *Law of Guarantees*, i. 433, 435; death, i. 438, 469; definition of Immaculate Conception, i. 438; concordat with Austria, i. 439; Syllabus, i. 440; General Council convoked, i. 441 443; definition of Papal Infallibility, i. 460; funeral of, i. 472; ii. 430, 435; convention with Portugal, ii. 420
Pius X., ii. 518; and Associations Law, i. 276; Pius and Church in Russia and Poland, i. 404; election, i. 486; brief sketch of life and work, i. 486–7; ii. 415, 463
Piusverein, i. 279, 297, 342
Placitum Regis, i. 76, 83, 85, 88, 93, 101, 108, 112, 157, 281, 316, 317, 328, 329, 373; ii. 353, 367
Pleitner, ii. 487
Plessis, Bishop, ii. 339
Plowden, ii. 7, 10
Plunket, Archbishop, ii. 211
Plunkett, Dr., of Meath, ii. 142, 145, 146
Plunkett, Mr., Solicitor-General of Australia, ii. 383
Podesti, i. 225
Poitiers, ii. 492
Poitou, i. 37
Poland, defective constitution, i. 182; Russian influence, i. 182; Poniatowski, king, i. 184; partition of Poland, i. 186; new constitution, civil war, further partitions of Poland, i. 186; Church in Poland, Catholics and Dissidents, i. 183; persecution under Catherine II., i. 188; favoured by Paul I. and Alexander I., i. 188-9; new ecclesiastical arrangements, i. 190; oppressed by Nicholas I., i. 192 *et seq.*; protest of Pius IX., i. 401; convention of Leo XIII. and Alexander III., i. 402; concordat, i. 195; Poland and Gregory XVI., i. 226; national movement and Russian tyranny, i. 399 400; language question, i. 303, 400, 405
Polding, Dr., O.S.B., Bishop of Hiero-Caesarea, ii. 384; Vicar-Apostolic of New Holland, Van Diemen's Land and adjoining islands, ii. 384; collects priests for Australian mission, ii. 384; reception in Australia, ii. 385; efforts to establish Catholic Church in Australia, ii. 385; visits Europe, ii. 386; created archbishop of Sydney, ii. 386, 387, 388, 393, 395, 399, 400, 411
Polignac, Prince, i. 58
Polynesia:—Marist Fathers in charge, Vicariate Apostolic of Central Oceanica, of New Caledonia, of Samoa and Navigator's Island, and of Fiji Islands, ii. 401
Pombal, Marquis de, i. 172
Pompallier, Vicar-Apostolic, Bishop, ii. 400
Poncheville, de, ii. 517
Pondicherry, ii. 419

Poniatowski, i. 183; King of Poland, i. 184; resigns, i. 187
Ponsonby, Mr., ii. 104, 116, 124, 125, 128, 129, 138, 151, 153, 155
Pontecorvo, i. 41
Poor Clares, ii. 220
Pope, Rev. Mr., ii. 174
Portal, M. L'Abbé, ii. 71, 73
Portalis, i. 36
Port Augusta, See of, ii. 393
Port Essington, Vicariate of, ii. 389
Port Jackson, ii. 379, 380
Portland, ii. 128
Portland, Duke of, ii. 256, 260
Port Louis, diocese of, ii. 424
Port of Spain, archdiocese of, ii. 426
Portugal; war with Napoleon, i. 43; Joseph Emmanuel, i. 172; Pombal and the Church, Maria Francisca, i. 174; war with France and Spain, i. 174 *et seq.*; Revolution, i. 176; National assembly, i. 176; Dom Miguel, Emperor, his policy, i. 178; civil war; Dom Pedro, king, i. 179; Revolution, i. 180. Church in Portugal: Persecution of Pombal, i. 173; reversed by Maria Francisca, i. 174; adverse policy of Dom Pedro, i. 179; Revolution and ineffective negotiations for concordat, i. 180; decline of religion, i. 390; Chartists and Septembrists, anti-ecclesiastical policy, i. 390 *et seq.*; State-control of the Church, i. 393, 395; religion and education, i. 395; efforts at Catholic organisation, i. 396; clergy in Portugal, i. 390-3
Port-Victoria, See of, ii. 393
Posen, See of, ii. 493
Possibilists, ii. 505
Pothier, O. S. B., ii. 438; ii. 489
Potthast, ii. 477
Pottier, Abbé, ii. 517, 523
Powderley, Terence, ii. 326
Power, Dr., ii. 259,
Power, Rev. Daniel, ii. 383
Powers and Switzerland, i. 137; and Netherlands, i. 149; and Portugal, i. 177
Powis, Earl of, ii. 227
Poynter, Dr., ii. 16, 19, 21, 157, 158
Pragmatic Sanction (Spain), i. 166
Praelectiones, ii. 447
Prague, Peace of, i. 283
Presentation Brothers, ii. 315, 443,
Presentation Sisters, ii. 314
Pressburg, Peace of, i. 84
Prince bishops. *See* Bishops
Prince Edward Island, ii. 336, 340
Principes Vrais Les de l'Église Gallicane, ii. 446
Privy Council, Irish, ii. 118, 119
Probst, ii. 487
Propaganda, Congregation of, ii. 415; sections for Latin and Oriental rites, ii. 415; College of Propaganda opened to students, ii. 415
Proske, Karl, ii. 488
Protestation, The, ii. 6
Proudhon, i. 326; ii. 502, 503
Provencher, Mgr., ii. 341
Providentissimus Deus, ii. 473, 474
Prussia and Napoleon, i. 42; Church in, i. 89-101 280-284; Frederick the Great, i. 89; Frederick William III.; Frederick William IV., i. 280; improved condition, i., 281; New constitution, i. 101, 283; war with Denmark and Austria, i. 283; German confederation, i. 284; Kulturkampf, i. 300; Catholic education, i. 320; clergy in Prussia, i. 89. *See Kulturkamp)*
"*Publicandum*" (of Prussian Government), i. 97
Public Instruction, Commission of, ii. 177
Pugin, Architect, ii. 41
"Punctuation of Ems," ii. 450
Purcell, Bishop, ii. 452
Pusey, ii. 31, 32, 39, 42; forbidden to preach within precints of university, ii. 45, 52, 53, 54, 77, 80, 81
Pustet & Co., ii. 489

Q

Quanta Cura Bull, ii. 60, 462
Quanta Laetitia, ii. 91
Quarantotti, Monsignor, ii. 21, 22, 156, 157
Quarterage, ii. 106
Quarterly Review, ii. 66

Quebec, ii. 336, 340, 343, 348, 349; Act, ii. 269, 337; First Provincial Council of, ii. 342; university at, ii. 347
Queen's County, ii. 141
Queensland, ii. 393
Qui pluribus abhinc annis, Encyclical, ii. 458, 462
Quillon, diocese of, ii. 420
Quinet, i. 227

R

Radbertus, Karl, ii. 503
Radet, General, i. 201
Radetzsky, General, i. 222
Ragey, ii. 469
Ralliés, i. 266
Rambler, The, ii. 59, 60, 64
Rampolla, Cardinal, i. 386
Raphoe, ii. 231
Rathcoole, ii. 379
Rathcormac, ii. 182
Rathfarnham, ii. 422, 424
Rathkeeran, ii. 180
Ratisbon, ii. 488, 489
Rauscher, prince bishop, i. 328, 332, 451–2
Ravignan, de, S.J., i. 68, 227; ii. 481
Razón y Fe, ii. 442
Reçeveur, ii. 475
Recollects, ii. 336; Order of, ii. 439; "Red Book" of English Catholic Committee, ii. 7
Redemptorists, Congregation of, ii. 427
Referendum, ii. 349, 351
Réflexions sur l'état d' Église en France pendant le XVIII.e siècle et sur sa situation actuelle, ii. 448
Reggio, Congress of, ii. 508
Regimental and Gaol Schools, ii. 222
Regium Donum, ii. 177
Reichstag, election of, ii. 506
Reichensperger, Peter and August, i. 282, 301, 310
Reichlin-Meldegg, Prof., of Freiburg, i. 121
Reign of Terror, i. 20, 23; opposition to, i. 24, 25, 28
Reinkens, Prof., i. 313, 461 *sqq.*
Reisach, Cardinal, i. 97, 223, 285, 286, 295
Reischl, i. 461
Relief Act, ii. 2
Renan, Ernest, i. 245; ii. 471
Renouf, i. 448; ii. 56
Republic. *See* France; Second Republic proclaimed, i. 67
Rerum Novarum, Encyclical, ii. 520
Restoration (in France), i. 56–59, 60; Louis XVIII. and Charles X.
Reusch, i. 465; ii. 471
Reuss, ii. 470
Révellière-Lepeaux, i. 28
Revolution, American (Influence in France), i. 8; French, ii. 101
Revue Biblique International, ii. 474
Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, ii. 478
Revue Germanique, ii. 472
Rhein, Zu (ministry), i. 111
Rhine, Confederation of, i. 42, 72
Rhine Provinces, Church in, i. 111–124. *See* Upper Rhine Provinces
Rhode Island, ii. 290
Ribot, M., i. 269
Rice, Edmond, ii. 220, 443
Ricci, Scipio, i 40, 81, 82
Riccio, Bishop, i. 459
Richard, Cardinal, i. 266, 268
Richmond, Diocese of, ii. 277
Rickaby, Father, ii. 469
Rights of Man, i. 12
Rights, Bill of, ii 109; and Duty of Labour, The, ii. 518
Rio de Janeiro, ii. 377
Rippold, i. 468
Rites, Congregation of, ii. 489
Ritter, Professor, ii. 457
Ritualist controversies in England, ii. 487
Rivarola, Cardinal, i. 216
Rivet, Bishop, i. 459
Rivoli, i. 26
Robespierre, i. 21–25, 28, 34
Rochelle, synod of, ii. 449
Rockhampton, Diocese of, ii. 394
Rogier, Charles, i. 358
Rohrbacher, i. 60; ii. 448, 475
Roma Sotteranea, ii. 476
Roman, Holy R. Empire, i. 42, 55; end of, i. 70
Romantic School in Germany, ii. 451
Rome, American College at, ii. 319, 497
Rome, taken by Italian army, i. 432; Italian occupation of, i. 435. *See* Papal States
Römische Briefe, i. 455
Rooter Berg, Battle of, i. 136
Roothan, Father i. 422

Rosatti, Bishop, ii. 296, 312
Roscommon, ii. 141
Roseau, Diocese of, ii. 426-427
Rose, ii. 29, 30, 31
Rosmini, i. 224; ii. 455-456
Rossi, Count, i. 422
Rossi, Count de, ii. 476
Roumania, Church in, i. 409
Rousseau, Jean Jacques, i. 8, 9, 28, 58, 173
Rouvier, M., i. 274
Rowan, ii. 128, 133
Rudigier, Bishop, i. 332
Rudini, Di Marquis, i. 474-475
Rue du Cheval Vert (Irish College in), ii. 254
Rugby School, ii. 25
Ruinart, ii. 437
Russia, Balkan Provinces, i. 405
Russia, Church in:—Catholics of Ruthenian Rite, i. 188 *sqq.*; persecuted, i. 193; Schismatical Act of Union, i. 193; and Poland, i. 182 *sqq.*; concordat and subsequently, i. 194 196; persecution, i. 400 *sqq.*; and Gregory XVI., i. 226; and Leo XIII., convention of, i. 402, 477; Catholic progress, i. 404; Napoleon and, i. 42, 48
Russell, Dr. C., President of Maynooth, ii. 44
Russell, Odo (English agent in Rome), i. 463; ii. 64
Russell, Lord John, ii. 117, 177, 186, 201, 202, 204
Ryswick, Peace of, ii. 362

S

Sacred Heart Missionaries, ii. 416
Sacred Heart, Basilica of, Montmartre, i. 255
Sacred Heart Sisters, ii. 314, 347, 391, 443
Sadleir, ii. 202, 203, 204, 205
Sadowa, Battle of, i. 283
Saffi, i. 423
Sagasta, Señor, i. 388
Sailer, Archbishop, ii. 488
Saint Raphael Society, ii. 331
Saint Simon, ii. 502
Sainte Clotilde's, ii. 516
Salamanca, ii. 253, 254, 265, 496
Sale, diocese of, ii. 391, 392
Sales, i. 461
Salesian Brothers, ii. 372, 428
Salesian Fathers, ii. 429
Salic Law, i. 165
Salinis, ii. 448
Salis-Soglio, General, i. 136
Salvador, Church in: Political vicissitudes of, ii. 357; concordat with Holy See, ii. 357; Catholic religion state religion, state of education in, ii. 358
Salzburg, ii. 494
Samlaman, Seminary at, ii. 89
Samoa, Vicariate Apostolic of, ii. 401
San Clemente, ii. 253
Sandhurst, diocese of, ii. 391, 392
Sangier Marc, ii. 517
San José, ii. 359
Sanseverino, ii. 467
Santa Anna, presidency of, ii. 352
Santa Cruz, ii. 427
Santa Maria dell' Anima, ii. 494
Sant' Andrea della Valle, ii. 194
Santiago, ii. 253; Archdiocese of, 361, 362
Sardinia, Charles Emmanuel of, i. 52
Sarnen, Confederation of, i. 130
Sarto, Cardinal, i. 486. *See* Pius X.
Satolli, Mgr. and Cardinal, ii. 318, 332, 468
Saturday Review, The, i. 456
Savine, i. 17
Savona, i. 42, 45, 52
Savoy, ii. 447
Scalan, Bishop, ii. 89
Scannell, Dr., ii. 73
Schanz, ii. 481
Schäzler, ii. 484
Scheeben, i. 455; ii. 483
Scheil, O. P., ii. 439
Schelling, ii. 456
Scherr, Archbishop, i. 285, 459
Schings, ii. 515
Schlegel, ii. 451, 479
Schmid, Professor, i. 297
Scholasticism, ii. 449. *See* Neo-Scholasticism and Louvain
Schönbrunn, Decree of Napoleon at, i. 41
Schrader, i. 442; ii. 484
Schreiber, Professor, i. 122
Schrems, ii. 488
Schulte, von, i. 461, 464, 465
Schultze, ii. 515
Schwane, ii. 483, 484
Schwarzenberg, prince bishop, i. 327, 332; Cardinal, i. 450, 457, 458

Schwetz, ii. 481
Scotland: Persecution of Catholics, 86-88; agitation against Relief Bill, ii. 88; compensation voted at request of Dr. Hay, ii. 88; education of priests, ii. 89; seminaries and government aid, ii. 89; Scotch Catholics at beginning of the century, ii. 90; increase owing to immigration; establishment of vicariates, ii. 91; emancipation, ii. 91-2; seminaries and education, ii. 93; disputes between Catholics in Glasgow, ii. 93-95; establishment of the hierarchy, ii. 95; present condition of Catholics, education, &c., ii. 96-7
Scott, Father, ii. 91, 93
Scott, Hope-Scott, ii. 39
Scott, Sir Walter, ii. 92
Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio, ii. 476
Scully, ii. 150
Secularisation policy (German), i. 71, 72; in Austria, i. 85; in France, i. 12, 13 *sqq.*; in Bavaria, i. 102, 111, 359; in Spain, i. 164; in Portugal, i. 177
Sedan, Battle of, i. 250, 432
Sedlnitzky, Prince bishop, i. 99
Segreti, ii. 477
Seminary for Foreign Missions, ii. 434
Seminaries *versus* Universities in Germany, ii. 493
Semler, ii. 470, 471
Senestréy, Bishop, i. 450, 451, 457
Separation Law in France, i. 274 *sqq.*
Separation of Church and State in Mexico, ii. 353-4
Separation of Church and State in Brazil, ii. 376-377
Sepp, ii. 481
September Convention, i. 430
Serrano, Marshal, i. 383
Seton, Mrs., ii. 275, 311
Seven Years' War, i. 75
Severoli, Cardinal, i. 214
Seville, ii. 253
Seward, Governor, ii. 312
Shaftesbury, i. 7
Shannon, Lord, ii. 124
Sharman-Crawford, ii. 183, 202–206, 345
Sheedy, Father, ii. 321
Sheil, Dr., ii. 392
Sheil, R. L., ii. 163, 169
Siam, ii. 434
Sibour, Archbishop, i. 63, 236, 241, 244
Sieyès, Abbé, i. 11, 13, 14, 27
Silesia, i. 89
Silesian War, i. 75
Simeoni, Cardinal, i. 402, 437
Simms, ii. 116
Simon, Jules, i. 258
Simon, Richard, ii. 469
Simor, Bishop, i. 459
Simpson, ii. 60, 400
Sinclair, ii. 116
Sinibaldi, ii. 469
Sisters of Charity, ii. 314, 347, 386, 391; Loretto, ii. 311, 314, 422, 424; Mercy, ii. 314, 389, 391; Nazareth, ii. 314, 423; Notre Dame, ii. 314, 347; Providence, ii. 314, 341, 347; St. Brigid, ii. 220; St. Elizabeth, ii. 443; St. Joseph, ii. 314, 341, 389, 391, 395, 443; the Good Pastor, ii. 443; the Holy Family, ii. 423-4; the Holy Cross, ii. 314, 347, 443; the Holy Name, ii. 314; the Poor, ii. 391
Slater, Dr., V.A., ii., 381, 383, 421
Slattery, Archbishop, ii. 197, 200, 238, 239
Sligo, ii. 141; Corporation, ii. 189
Sloutsk, Confederation of i. 184
Smith, Dr., ii. 427
Smith, Erasmus, ii. 217
Smits, i. 156
Smyrna, Archbishop of, ii. 430
Social Democratic Federation, English, ii. 510
Social Democratic Workingmen's Party, ii. 509
Socialism: most remarkable development in century, ii. 498; reasons for this, ii. 499; Socialism natural consequence of Liberalism, ii. 500; stages in Socialism, ii. 501; Socialist leaders and principles, ii. 502 *sqq.*; foundation of International Association of Workingmen and spread of on the Continent, ii. 504, 505; disunion and rivalry between Socialists and formation of Anarchist Party, ii. 505; different aims and policy of Anarchists and Socialists, ii. 505-6; spread

Socialism—*continued*
of, in different countries: AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.—Socialist programme same as Erfurt programme, ii. 506; separate federal associations work in common, ii. 506; present state of Socialists, ii. 507; BELGIUM, DENMARK, HOLLAND, NORWAY, SWEDEN.—Rapid progress in, ii. 507, 508; ENGLAND.—Working classes unaffected, ii. 510; disunion in Socialist Democratic Federation, ii. 510; various organisations, ii. 510; FRANCE.-Reason of failure division into two groups, ii. 507; GERMANY.—Union of parties of Marx and Lassalle, adoption of Erfurt programme, spread of associations shown at Reichstag elections, journals published by Socialist and chief leaders of, ii. 506; ITALY, SPAIN and PORTUGAL.–Anarchism more prevalent than Socialism in Italy, reasons for this ii. 508; establishment of Marxian policy, disunion between Extremists and Moderates, ii. 508; small influence of Socialism in Spain, ii. 508; rapid spread in Portugal, ii. 509; SWITZERLAND.—Reasons for lack of success of Socialist scheme, ii. 500; UNITED STATES.—Late establishment of Socialism; great aim of Socialists, ii. 509
Socialist Labour Party of North America, ii. 509
Society for Foreign Missions, ii. 422, 433; of African Missions, ii. 442; of Heart of Jesus, ii. 440; of Jesus. *See* Jesuits; of St. Stephen, i. 341. *See* Spain; of the Faith of Jesus, ii. 440
Solesmes, Benedictine monastery at, ii. 489
Solferino, Battle of, i. 248, 426
Solidaires, Society of, i. 246, 360
Sollicitudo omnium Ecclesiarum, ii. 440
Somaglia, Della, Cardinal, i. 202, 215
Sonderbund, War of the, i. 135, 136
Sorbonne, ii. 259
Soult, Marshal, i. 50
Spahn, Dr. Martin, i. 313
Spain and Netherlands, i. 153; Church in, i. 160 *sqq.*; Charles III., Charles IV., i. 160; Joseph Bonaparte in, i. 161 *sqq.*; Cortes of 1810 and religion, i. 162–3; Ferdinand VII. and Cortes of 1820, i. 163-4; Carlist wars and Church, i. 165–72; Espartero and O'Donnell, i. 381–2; revolution of 1868 and anarchy, i. 383-4; Alphonsus XII. and Leo XIII., i. 384–7; proposed Law of Associations defeated, i. 389; Leo XIII. arbitrator, i. 476; ecclesiastical education in, ii. 496; Socialism in, ii. 508
Spaur, Count, i. 423
Speckbacher, i. 107
Spectator, The, i. 456
Spencer, ii. 128
Spencer, Ignatius, ii. 36, 41
Spetia, ii. 477
Spicilegium, Casinense, ii. 476; *Romanum*, ii. 476; *Solesmense* ii. 476
Spiegel, von, Archbishop, i. 95
Spina, Archbishop, i. 30, 31, 32
S.S. Patrum Nova Bibliotheca 476
Stanhope, Lord, ii. 5
Stanley, ii. 39, 78
Stanley, Mr., Chief Secretary 223, 225
Stanton, ii. 47
States. *See* Papal
States-General, France. *See* Estates
States-General, Holland, i. 147
Stephens, ii. 212; Uriah, ii. 326
Stephen's Green, ii. 242
Stevenists, i. 142
Steyl, ii. 416
Stillwater, ii. 317
Stöckl, i. 456; ii. 467
Stöger, i. 80
Stolberg, ii. 451
Stoneyhurst, ii. 47, 76; *Philosophical Series*, ii. 469
Stradbrooke Island, ii. 393
Strain, Dr., ii. 94, 95
Strait Settlements, ii. 434
Strassburg, ii. 493
Strauss, David, i. 132, 245; ii. 471
Stuart, Sir Charles, i. 175
Stuart, Villiers, ii. 166
Studies, Ecclesiastical: Low condition of ecclesiastical education at beginning of century and

Studies, Ecclesiastical—*continued*
causes for, ii. 465; dangers to Church in Scripture, philosophy, history and Oriental languages, ii. 466; Neo-Scholastic movement, leading men in, ii. 467; kindly attitude of Pope towards Neo-Scholastic movement, ii. 467 *et seq.*; Adherents of Neo-Scholasticism in differen countries, ii. 469. SCRIPTURE:—Reaction against divine authority of Scripture, ii. 470; rise of Higher Criticism and consequent danger to the Bible, ii. 470; principles of attack on Old and New Testaments, ii. 471-481; attitude of Catholics towards Higher Criticism, ii. 471-472; definition of Vatican Council prevents Catholic scholars from taking up an extreme position, ii. 473; various opinions of Catholic scholars in reference to certain Scriptural questions, ii. 473; errors condemned in the Encyclical, *Providentissimus Deus*, ii. 473; establishment of Biblical Commission, ii. 474; activity of Catholic scholars during last thirty years, ii. 474. ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY:—Neglect of historical studies at beginning of century, ii. 475; revival of historical studies, ii. 475; Patristic period object of special research, ii. 476; study of ancient inscriptions and monuments, ii. 476-477; authorities on history of Papacy, ii. 477; authorities on Councils of the Church, ii. 477; authorities on Reformation period, ii. 478; excellent quality of work done by Catholic scholars, ii. 478. APOLOGETICS:—Increasing importance of apologetics and reasons for, ii. 479; method of defence in early years of nineteenth century, ii. 479; different methods of defence used by different schools, ii. 480; Catholic apologists in different fields, ii. 480; difficulties urged against Catholic religion from a comparison of religions, ii. 481; remarkable Catholic apologists of various countries, ii. 481. DOGMATIC THEOLOGY, ii. 481;
Studies, Ecclesiastical—*continued*
Causes for decline of, ii. 481; remarkable developments in theological science, ii. 482; new methods adopted, ii. 482; consequences of application of historical methods, ii. 483; rise of new department of history of dogma, ii. 484; revival of Scholastic method of treating theological subjects, ii. 485; beneficial results of Higher criticism, ii. 485. MORAL THEOLOGY:—False strictness in moral theology during early years of nineteenth century, ii. 485; Ethics and sociology, ii. 485-486; chief masters on moral theology, ii. 486. LITURGICAL STUDIES:—Reason for low condition of at beginning of century, ii. 486; general reception of Roman Liturgy, ii. 486; noted historians of liturgy, ii. 487. CHURCH MUSIC:—Low condition of at beginning of century, ii. 487; reform, to whom due, ii. 487; men who brought about reform, ii. 488; restoration of Plain Chant, ii. 488-489: efforts made in Ireland, ii. 489
St. Alphonsus, *Moral Theology* of, ii. 485
St. Antony, Franciscan College of, ii. 253
St. Boniface, Abbey of, ii. 461
St. Cecilia, Irish Society of, ii. 489
St. Cecilia, Society of, ii. 488
St. Christopher, Island of, ii. 427
St. Gall, ii. 494
St. George, diocese, ii. 349
St. Isidore's, ii. 253, 380
St. James's, ii. 124
St. John, Ambrose, ii. 47
St. John's Cathedral, ii. 349
St. John's College, ii. 411
St. Louis, ii. 25, 290, 315, 320
St. Lucia, ii. 426, 427
St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, ii. 319
St. Patrick, Brothers of, ii. 443
St. Sulpice, ii. 97, 319, 492
St. Thomas, Island of, ii. 427
St. Vincent, ii. 426, 427
Stumpf, Professor, i. 464
Sue, Eugene, i. 66
Sulpicians, ii. 336, 339, 346, 469, 497

Suppression of Jesuits, Influence of on Missions, ii. 414. *See* Jesuits
Sur, van, i. 157
Swan River Colony
Sweden, Persecution of Catholics, in, i. 416; removal of some restrictions, i. 417
Swift, Dean, ii. 101
Swift, Richard, ii. 207
Switzerland, constitution of and revolution, i. 125-7; effect on Catholic cantons, i. 127; Catholic organisation and education, i. 128-9; rise of the Liberal party, i. 129-30; Articles of Baden, i. 131; suppression of monasteries in Aargau, i. 133; Catholic party in Lucerne, the Jesuits introduced, both parties ready for war, i. 133-6; war of the Sonderbund and consequences, i. 136-8; attacks of Radicals and Liberals, i. 343; persecution after Vatican Council, i. 345-52; Catholics found University of Freiburg, social organisation, &c., i. 352-54; legal position of Catholics in Switzerland, i. 354; opposition to Papal Infallibility, i. 467; favour for Old Catholics, i. 474; conciliatory policy of Leo XIII., i. 476; ii. 135; ecclesiastical education in, ii. 494-5; Socialism in, ii. 507; Catholic Labour movement in, ii. 516, 519
Sydney, University, ii. 411
Sydney, Viscount, Secretary of Admiralty, ii. 379
Syllabus of Pius IX., i. 249, 438, 440; ii. 60; ii. 462
Syllabus of Pius X., i. 487; ii. 480
Symbolik, ii. 482
Syria, ii. 431

T

Taafe, Viscount, ii. 104, 105
Tadolini, i. 225
Taine, i. 245
Tait, ii. 42, 84
Talamo, ii. 468
Talbot, ii. 5, 7
Talleyrand, i. 14, 17, 18, 31, 36, 38, 41, 44, 53, 209
Talleyrand, Périgord Cardinal, ii. 446
Tamburini, i. 82
Tandy, Napper, ii. 116
Targovica, Confederation of, i. 186
Taschereau, ii. 327
Tasman, Commodore, ii. 399
Tasmania, ii. 380, 388; Church in, ii. 399 *sqq.*; education, Catholics refuse secularism in, ii. 410
Tasmania University, ii. 411
Taxation in France before Revolution, i. 5
Taxil, Leo, i. 264
Ten Broek, Catholic Leader, i. 156
Testem Benevolentiae, Encyclical ii. 334
Texas, State of, ii. 268
Theiner, Father A., i. 429, 484; ii. 477
Themines, De, i. 66
Theologie, La, de Toulouse, ii. 447
Theophilanthropists, i. 28, 29
Therry, Mr., Commissioner of Bequests, ii. 383
Therry, Rev. John Joseph: volunteers for the Australian Mission, ii. 381; arrival there, ii. 382; hampered in his work by Governor, ii. 382; builds first Australian Church, ii. 382; opposes proselytising agencies of Government, ii. 382; opens special Catholic cemeteries, ii. 383; refuses bribe to leave Sydney, ii. 383, 384; goes to Tasmania, ii. 399, 405
Thibaudier, Mgr., i. 264
Thiers, M., i. 67, 237, 251; president of Third Republic, i. 252, 255, 272
Third Party in France, i. 249
Thomas, St., Philosophy of, i. 483
Thorbecke, i. 373, 374
Thorn, Lutheran League, i. 184
Thornton, General, ii. 169
Thorvaldsen, i. 225
Throckmorton, Mr., ii. 7
Thüm, i. 156
Thurles, ii. 180; College at, ii. 266; Synod of, ii. 240, 241
T'ien-tsen, Treaty of, ii. 432
Tierra Austral del Espiritu Santo ii. 378
Tiid, The, i. 156
Tilsit, Peace at, i. 43, 190
Times, The, i. 456; ii. 50

Tipperary, ii. 217, 231
Tippoo Sahib, ii. 418
Tithe Agistment Act, ii. 178
Tithe agitation in Ireland, ii. 176-83
Tithe, Commission, ii. 179
Tixeront, ii. 484
Tobago, ii. 426, 427
Tokio, Archdiocese of, ii. 435
Toland, i. 7
Toledo, ii. 496
Tolentino, Treaty of, i. 26
Toler, ii. 120; Solicitor-General, ii. 129
Tone, Wolfe, *Argument on behalf of Catholics of Ireland*, ii. 116, 117
Tone, Wolfe, Secretary to Catholic Committee, ii. 120, 128, 133, 134
Tongiorgi, ii. 468
Torbay, i. 54
Toronto, ii. 340, 343
Tosti, ii. 438
Toulouse, ii. 254, 492
Tournely, ii. 440
Townshend, ii. 106
Tradition de l'Église sur l'institution des Évêques, ii. 448
Transvaal, Church in, ii. 422
Treaty of Fontainebleau, i. 175
Treaty of Nanking, ii. 432
Treaty of T'ien-Tsin, ii. 432
Treaty of Tilsit, i. 190
Treaty of Tolentino, i. 26
Treaty of Berlin, i. 406 *sqq.*
Trench, Archbishop, ii. 174
Trent, Bishop of, i. 106
Treves, ii. 493
Trichinopoly, ii. 420
Triennial Act, ii. 109
Trim, ii. 105
Trimleston, Lord, ii. 104, 105, 106, 162
Trinidad, ii. 426, 427
Trinity College, ii. 126, 127
Trochu, General, i. 250
Troy, Archbishop, ii. 123, 139, 143, 145
Troyes, Oblates of St. Francis of Sales at, ii. 416
Tuam, ii. 189
Tübingen, ii. 484
Tübingen, School, ii. 471. *See* University of
Tuileries, i. 13, 18, 20, 27
Turgot, Comptroller-General, i. 9
Turin, Oblates of St. Francis of Sales at, ii. 416
Turkey in Europe, difficulties and Progress of Church in, i. 405-6
Turmel, ii. 484
Tyrone, ii. 132, 136

U

Ubaghs, Professor, ii. 454
Ullathorne, Father, Vicar-General of Australia, ii. 384 *sqq.*
Ultramontanes, ii. 60; in Bavaria, i. 287; in England, ii. 4; in France, i. 240 *sqq.*, 249, 259, 429, 443; ii. 449; in Germany, i. 302. *See* Conservative and Liberal Catholics
Ultramontanism, i. 287; ii. 143
Uniates, i. 401, 404
Union in Belgium against Dutch, i. 149
Union of Fribourg, ii. 519
United Irishmen, ii. 133, 134
United States, Church in, Spaniards pioneers, Maryland founded, ii. 268; persecution of Catholics in Protestant colonies, 268-69; persecution ceases owing to loyalty displayed by Catholics in War of Independence, ii. 269; tolerant form of constitution, ii. 270; change in government of Church rendered necessary by change in civil government, ii. 270; priests oppose appointment of a bishop, ii. 271; Dr. Carroll appointed, ii. 272; refugees from France assist in founding colleges and convents in United States, ii. 273-274; origin of American branch of Visitation Sisters, and of Sisters of Charity, ii. 274-275; increased population and establishment of hierarchy, establishment of more colleges, ii. 276-78; first council, ii. 278. OBSTACLES TO PROGRESS OF CATHOLICITY:—Dangers from Lay Trusteeism, ii. 278; disputes break out in chief Catholic centres between bishops and trustees, ii. 280-281; instruction of Propaganda in regard to Lay Trusteeism, ii. 281; decision of First Catholic Council in regard to Lay Trusteeism, ii. 282; work of Drs. Hughes and Kenrick, ii. 283;

United States—*continued*
system of Lay Trustees condemned by Second Catholic Council, ii. 284; bishops hold ecclesiastical property in trust; friendly attitude of various States towards this system, ii. 284; United States, population of, increased by emigration from Europe, ii. 285, 286; hostile feelings between native Americans and newcomers, ii. 286; bad feelings increased by fact that many of the newcomers were Catholics, ii. 287; riots, ii. 287-88; bad feeling further aggravated by disclosures of Maria Monk, ii. 288; military called in to quell riots, ii. 288; "Know Nothing Party" formed, ii. 289; "American Protective Association" formed; its policy, tactics and extent, ii. 290; gradual downfall of the, ii. 291. DEVELOPMENT, SYNODS, ORGANISATION:—Rapid development of Catholic Church from end of eighteenth century, ii. 291-292; statistics of Catholic Church at different periods in nineteenth century, ii. 292; causes of this development, ii. 293; numerous conversions in America, ii. 294; foundation and purpose of Paulist Society ii. 294; "Catholic Missionary Union" founded, ii. 294; regulations passed by first American Synod. ii. 295; further regulations of American bishops, ii. 295; decrees of first provincial synod of America, ii. 296; regulations of second and other provincial synods, ii. 297; Plenary Council summoned, ii. 297; regulations passed at, ii. 298; erection of new bishoprics, ii. 298; attitude of Catholic Church during Slave War, ii. 299; necessity for a council of bishops at conclusion of war, ii. 299; composition of council and matters dealt with, ii. 300; approval by Pope, ii. 301; American bishops at Vatican Council; attitude of towards Papal Infallibility, ii. 302; first Cardinal created in America, ii. 302; American archbishops in Rome; second plenary council; matters dealt with, ii. 302, 303; summary of matters dealt with by American councils, ii. 303; method of appointment of bishops, ii. 304 *et seq.*; legislation in regard to parishes, 306 *et seq.*; legislation in regard to consultors, ii. 308. CATHOLIC EDUCATION AND MISSIONS:—Primary and Secondary schools at first of private enterprise, ii. 309; religious orders in charge of schools, ii. 311; efforts of Catholics to make schools more suitable, ii. 311; withdrawal of state support from Catholic schools, ii. 312; agitation for removal of inequality between Catholic and Protestant schools, ii. 313; introduction of undenominational education, ii. 313; further development of parochial schools, ii. 314; religious orders of men and women in charge, ii. 314; resolutions of the Councils in regard to education, ii. 315 *et sqq.*; the "Faribault" system and the controversy regarding it, ii. 317-318; some defects of present school system, ii. 319; seminaries for education of priests, ii. 319; foundation of Catholic University of America, ii. 328; causes retarding its development, ii. 321; Catholic Summer School, foundation and aim of, ii. 321; efforts made to evangelize and civilize native tribes, ii. 322; incorporation of "The Bureau of Indian Catholic Missions," ii. 323; Negro element; efforts made to evangelize; establishment of Catholic Board for work among coloured people, and St. Joseph's Society for Negro Missions, ii. 323-325; LABOUR QUESTION IN THE STATES, ii. 325; Reasons why Labour Question should be a burning one in America, ii. 325; first trades union founded, ii. 326. foundation and development of Knights of Labour, ii. 326; introduction into Canada and condemnation of, ii. 327; position of in United States, ii. 327; con-

United States—*continued*
demnation of in United States averted; reasons for, ii. 328; Socialism, rise and progress of in United States; formation of Socialist Trade and Labour Alliance and Socialist Party, ii. 329; not likely to prove dangerous in future, and reasons for, ii. 329; attitude of Catholic Church towards Labour Question. LATER DEVELOPMENTS:—progress of Catholicity manifested by centenary celebrations, Baltimore, ii. 330; harmony amongst Catholics marred by disunion amongst different nationalities, ii. 331; scheme of providing for religious and educational needs of each nationality opposed by hierarchy, ii. 331; Pope participates in great Exposition and Papal delegate appointed, ii. 332; peace of American Church still further disturbed, ii. 332; controversy further accentuated by French translation of life of Fr. Hecker, ii. 333; Pope ends controversy on Americanism by publication of Encyclical, *Testem Benevolentiae*, ii. 334–335
Univers, L', i. 66, 234, 241, 243, 244, 247, 248, 249, 443, 446; ii. 460
Universities, Catholic: of Paris, i. 257; Angers, i. 257; Lille, i. 257; Lyons, i. 257; Toulouse, i. 257; attacks on these, i. 260; Catholic University of Ireland, ii. 241–46; ii. 247, 248, 250. *See* Ireland. Catholic University of Freiburg in Switerland, i. 352; ii. 439, 516; Catholic University of Washington, ii. 320, 497; University of Louvain, i. 142, 357; 372; ii. 5; Neo-scholastic movement in, i. 483; ii. 468; School of History at, ii. 478; Theological Faculty of, ii. 495; Traditionalism in, ii. 454; Catholic University of Laval, ii. 347 *sqq.*; University of Malta, ii. 426
Universities, Catholic and German, i. 322; in Bavaria, i. 104; anti-Catholic measures in Austria, i. 340
University: of Alcala, ii. 5; of Berne, i. 347; of Brussels, i. 357; of Cambridge, ii. 30; of Coimbra, i. 395; ii. 441; of Dublin, ii. 235, 237, 249; of Giessen, i. 297; of Heidelberg, ii. 513; of Munich, i. 110; of Oxford, ii. 21, 25; of Salamanca, ii. 5; of Strassburg, i. 313, 476; of Warsaw, i. 191; of Sydney, ii. 411; of Melbourne, ii. 411; of Adelaide and Hobart, ii. 411; of New Zealand, ii. 412; Royal University (Ireland), ii. 249-50; National University (Ireland), ii. 252; Queen's University (Belfast), 252. *See* Education, University
Upper Rhine Provinces: Clergy in, i. 111–124, 290-299; Church in, i. 111–124; negotiations for concordat—Erastian intrigues—restrictions, i. 115 *sqq.*
Urrábaru, ii. 469
Ursuline Sisters, ii. 314
Uruguay, Church in; early history and population of, ii. 374; Catholic religion state religion, ii. 374; state of education, ii. 374; ecclesiastical government of, ii. 374
Ushaw, ii. 57, 76
Utrecht, peace of, i. 139
Utrecht, union of, i. 153

V

Val-de-Bois, ii. 517
Valence, ii. 148
Valladolid, ii. 89, 97
Valmy, i. 22
Van der Noot, i. 81
Van Diemen's Land, ii. 381, 384, 385
Vancouver, Bishopric of, ii. 341
Vannutelli, Cardinal, i. 365
Vaterland i. 342; ii. 522
Vatican Council:—Suspended, i. 433; convoked by Pius IX., i. 441; invitations, i. 442; attitude of powers, i. 444; German Catholic opposition, i. 445; preliminaries, i. 449; opening, i. 449; proceedings, i. 451–459; petitions for and against Infallibility, i. 452; promulgation of dogma, i. 460; prorogation, i. 460; library, ii. 35

Vaughan, Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, ii. 70 *sqq.*, ii. 443
Vaughan, Dom Bede, ii. 397
Venaissin, i. 19
Vendée, La, i. 5, 24, 37
Venezuela, ii. 363; Church in, ii. 365-6
Venice, ii. 517; conclave at, i. 29
Ventura, Padre, i. 440; ii. 194, 196, 197, 454
Vercelli, Bishop of, i. 31
Vergara, convention of, i. 167
Verhaegen, ii. 523
Versailles, i. 10 *sqq.*
Veto:—On Papal Elections; Austria exercises it, i. 214; Spain, i. 219; abolished by Pius X.
Veto controversy in Ireland, ii. 142-62. *See* Ireland
Veuillot, Louis, i. 66, 234, 237, 241 *sqq.*, 447; ii. 460
Vicari, Herman von., i. 119, 123, 288; education struggle, i. 293 *sqq.*, 313
Victor Emmanuel I., i. 210
Victor Emmanuel II., i. 424 *sqq.*, 430, 437, 438
Victor Emmanuel III., i. 273
Victoria, ii. 390, 391; province of, ii. 341
Vie de Jésus, ii. 471
Vienna. *See* Congress
Vienna, St. Augustine's in, ii. 494
Vignelli, Abbé, i. 55
Vigouroux, ii. 480
Villafranca, Peace of, i. 426
Villiers, Henry de Bouillon, i. 7
Vincent de Paul Society, i. 64
Vincent de Paul, St., ii. 275
Vincent of Lerins, St., ii. 483
Vincentians, ii. 319, 391
Virginia, State of, ii. 268, 270
Visitation Sisters, ii. 314
Vissche, de Celles, i. 155
Vittoria, ii. 488
Volksverein, i. 325; ii. 522
Vollmar, ii. 506
Voltaire, i. 7, 37, 58, 173, 246
Volunteers, Convention of, ii 109; Convention of, at Dublin, ii. 112
Von Hertling, Baron, ii. 469, 515
Von Lichtenstein, Prince, ii. 516, 522
Von Schorlemer-Alst, Baron, ii. 515, 522
Von Vogelsang, Baron, ii. 516, 522
Vonckists, i. 140
Vorges, de, ii. 469
Vorwärts, ii. 506

W

Waal, ii. 476
Wagram, i. 43, 84
Waldeck-Rousseau, i. 267, 269, 270
Wallace, ii. 154
Wallon, i. 257
Wallstown, ii. 180
Walmsley, Dr., ii. 7, 8, 10
Walsh, Dr., ii. 49
Walter, ii. 487
Ward, W. G., i. 447; ii. 39, 41, 42, 45; submission of to Rome, ii. 56, 57, 58
Ware, St. Edmund's College, ii. 56
Washington, ii. 275, 320, 332; Catholic University at, ii. 497
Waterford, ii. 106; College at, ii. 266; Corporation, ii. 189, 209, 220, 230
Waterloo, i. 54
Weathers, Canon, i. 442
Weiss, ii. 481, 515; O.P., ii. 439
Weld, ii. 20, 272
Wellesley, i. 49, 163, 176
Wellhausen, ii. 470
Wellington, Diocese of, ii. 400, 401; Duke of, i. 50, 54; ii. 168
Werkmeister, i. 112
Wessenberg, von, i. 74, 113, 114, 128; ii. 450
Westmeath, ii. 142
Westmoreland, Lord, ii. 115, 119, 121, 124
Westphalia, Peace of, i. 70, 153
Wette, de, ii. 470
Wexford, ii. 136; College at, ii. 266
Whately, Archbishop, ii. 25, *sqq.*, 185, 223 *sqq.*
White Fathers, ii. 416, 442
Whitfield, ii. 296, 297, 312
Wicklow, ii. 141
Wilberforce, ii. 54, 55, 77, 79, 84
Wilkes, Rev. J., ii. 8, 10, 11
William I., Emperor of Germany, i. 312
William I. of Orange, King of Netherlands, i. 144, 154; his policy, i. 145, 147; conspires against Spain, i. 153
William I. of Würtemberg, i. 295
William II. of Prussia, i. 20; Emperor of Germany, i. 312, 313, 322, 480

William II. of Holland, Church policy of, i. 156, 373
William III. of Germany, i. 303
William IV. of Prussia, ii. 186
William V., of Netherlands, i. 154
Williams, ii. 79
Willson, Dr., ii. 386, 399
Wilmot, John, ii 12
Wilpert, ii. 476
Wilson, ii. 79
Winchester, ii. 12
Windham, ii. 128, 149
Windischmann, ii. 457
Windthorst, i. 301, 310, 311, 313, 325
Winterer, ii. 515
Witt, Franz, ii. 488
Wiseman, ii. 35 *sqq.*; Nicholas, Cardinal—birth, parentage, studies at Waterford, Ushaw, Rome, ii. 35; his Oriental studies, publication of *Horae Syricae*, &c., rector of English College at Rome, ii. 35–6; lectures on connexion between Science and Revealed Religion, ii. 36; returns to England, founds *Dublin Review*, ii. 37; article on the Donatists, ii. 39–40; rector of Oscott, and bishop, 40–41; watches progress of Oxford movement and helps the converts, ii. 43-9; created Cardinal and defends establishment of the hierarchy, ii. 49-51; synod of Oscott and disputes with chapter and coadjutor, 56–9; Wiseman and the Liberal Catholic School, ii. 59–60; opposition to Catholic
Wiseman—*continued*
hall at Oxford, ii. 62; his death, ii. 62; ii. 196, 207, 460, 480, 481
Woeste, i., 360, 362
Wolfe, ii. 129
Woodlock, Dr., Rector of Catholic University, ii. 245
Wrightson, Mr., ii. 105
Wulf, de, ii. 469
Würtemberg, i. 111. 295, 296
Würzburg, ii. 493

X

Xaverian, Brothers, ii. 443

Y

Yarra River, ii. 390
York, New, ii. 280
Yorke, Rev. P., ii. 290

Z

Zahn, i. 456
Zanardelli, i. 473
Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie, ii. 442; *für Philosophie und Katholische Theologie*, ii. 457
Zelanti, i. 214
Zemp, Dr., i. 353
Zigliara, O.P., ii. 439, 468
Zobl, ii. 484
Zoglio, i. 79
Zululand, ii. 422

END OF VOLUME II

M. H. GILL AND SON, LTD., DUBLIN AND WATERFORD

DUCKETT

270.8
M123
v.2

24416

History of the catholic
church in the 19th.
cent. (1789-1908)
/J. MacCaffrey

270.8
M123
v.2

24416

Graduate Theological Union
Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709

DEMCO